LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PRINCETON, N. J.

PRESENTED BY

Estate of Rev. George G. Smith

BR 145 .G43 1836 v.1
Gieseler, Johann Karl
Ludwig, 1792-1854.
Text-book of ecclesiastical
history

Luther Halsey's

To G. G. S.

Presented while I was packing Grandpa's books preparatory to his removal to Hammonton New Jersey.

Blooming Grove,
Thursday, May 28th 1868.
G.W.S.

1868.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

FROM PROFESSOR STUART, OF ANDOVER, MASS.

Theological Seminary, Andover, 25 *July*, 1836.

The undersigned has frequently consulted Gieseler's Church History, as published by the author in German: and he has no hesitation in saying, that on the whole he prefers it, for purposes such as he has had in view, to any other church history within his knowledge. His particular reason for this is, the uncommon diligence, judgment, and accuracy, with which the writer has given the essence of the sources on which he relies for important facts and documents; by virtue of which one is enabled in a good measure to judge for himself what the state of the original testimony is. This is a privilege which must often be abandoned, for the most part, in reading many writers in this department of history, inasmuch as they only give their own judgment and estimation of facts, without enabling the reader to form his.

With some of the *theological* opinions of Gieseler, the writer of this supposes himself to disagree; but these are seldom admitted to be the guide of his historical statements. In general, I think great candour, accuracy, and thorough search, are developed in Gieseler's work, although its studied brevity cuts off detail which now and then would be grateful to the reader.

I fully admit the learning and ability of Neander, as a Church historian; but Gieseler places one in a better condition to judge for himself than Neander does, who gives his sources very meagrely, and seems to expect that you will always take his own views as well-grounded and correct. Gieseler places his reader in a condition, in which he is enabled to pursue his investigations to any extent that he pleases. On this account, I use him as my most common manual, when I have occasion to pursue a topic which belongs to his department, and as a *manual* for consultation, I think this work can hardly fail of the patronage of our American community.

MOSES STUART.

FROM PROFESSOR EMERSON, OF ANDOVER, MASS.

Judging from such portions as I have read of Gieseler's work, (perhaps one-fourth of the whole,) I am happy to concur in the above commendation. I would just add, that I am particularly pleased with his plan and the divisions of his work, and shall be happy to see it in a good English dress.

RALPH EMERSON.

FROM PROFESSOR HODGE, OF PRINCETON, N. J.

Princeton, July 29, 1836.

I have been led to entertain a very high opinion of the merits of Gieseler's Ecclesiastical History, not only from the success of the work in its own country, but from a knowledge of its plan and from an occasional inspection of its contents. Its distinguishing feature is the copious citation of authorities and the extracts from the early writers given in the notes. It thus opens before the student the very sources of historical knowledge, and presents the events and opinions of former ages in their original form and spirit. I therefore think that Mr. Cunningham has performed a very important service in rendering this work accessible to the Christian public.

C. HODGE.

FROM PROF. SEARS, OF NEWTON THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION.

Newton Theological Institution, August 15, 1836.

I am happy to learn that you have translated Gieseler's Manual of Church History. For the distinguished author, whose acquaintance I had the pleasure of making while in Germany, I entertain sentiments of very high respect; and though differing from some of his theological opinions, I regard his manual as the most perfect *text-book* before the public. Neander's work has another design, Mosheim's can no longer be used, Guericke's is too polemical and unattractive, and Hase's too brief. Gieseler is, to say the least, the second, and in some respects the first Ecclesiastical historian of the age;—his critical accuracy is unrivalled, his method clear, his literary notices complete, and his authorities very copious and well chosen.

B. SEARS.

FROM PROFESSOR WARE, OF CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

August 6, 1836.

I am glad to learn, that your translation of Giescler's Church History is to appear soon. A better book than we before had, for the study of Ecclesiastical History, was greatly wanted: and this work, it seems to me, gives fairer promise, than any other with which I am acquainted, to supply that want.

The plan, and the arrangement and distribution of parts has great advantages; and the extreme brevity of the text is well compensated by constant reference in the notes to the original sources, copious citation of authorities, and an ample and minute supply of dates. The liberal and impartial spirit running through the work is worthy also of all commendation.

HENRY WARE.

Geo. G. Smith.

From Grandp

May 27.

TEXT-BOOK

OF

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

BY

J. C. L. GIESELER,

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY, AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN GÖTTINGEN.

TRANSLATED FROM THE THIRD GERMAN EDITION

BY FRANCIS CUNNINGHAM.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOLUME I.

PHILADELPHIA:

CAREY, LEA, AND BLANCHARD.

1836.

Entered according to act of Congress in the year one thousand eight hundred and thirty-six,
By Carey, Lea, and Blanchard,
in the Clerk's office of the District Court of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

CAMBRIDGE PRESS:
METCALF, TORRY, AND BALLOU.

PREFACE.

The first volume of this work appeared in Germany in 1824, and passed through three editions, 1824, 1827, 1831, before the completion of the second volume, in 1835. The cause of this great, for such a work probably unprecedented success, is no doubt mainly the peculiar plan on which it is constructed. It will be seen by a glance at the main body of the work, that by far the greatest part of it consists of extracts from the original sources; the text itself, though containing a complete view of the whole field of Church History, being exceedingly compressed. The advantages of such a plan for a manual of this study will at once be manifest. On the one hand, the student does not wish to be encumbered with long disquisitions on subjects so hard and dry as for the most part here are treated of, and on the other it is important that he should have the means of investigating them on occasion; whilst frequently the points involved are so refined and delicate that the mistranslation of a word, or even the substitution of one language for another, may essentially modify the idea. To use the author's own words in his Preface to the original edition of the work; "It is no where more true than in Church History, that it is impossible rightly to understand an age gone by, without allowing it to speak for itself; the subjects involved in this study being often such as are least easily rendered into a foreign language."

"The passages are extracted," he proceeds, "either to prove something which on historical or dogmatical grounds has been held doubtful, or to explain what is obscure, or lastly, on account of their intrinsic historical importance. The references contained in the notes, cannot of course claim to be complete. The aim has been to mention the best works on each subject, and also such as are historically remarkable.

"General works are cited on particular points only when the views they contain are remarkable for their justice or their peculiarity. Occasionally a short sketch is attempted of the various views given by different parties of important sects in the church."

Another recommendation of this work, as a manual for the study of Ecclesiastical History, consists in the arrangement of the Periods and Divisions, which is probably as perspicuous and uninvolved as is consistent with the nature of the subject. The old division into centuries has long been forsaken, and the methods adopted have been as various as the works that have appeared; but it is believed that no one has yet been more successful in this difficult task than Professor Gieseler.

Anything further here by way of recommendation is rendered unnecessary, however, by the testimonials to the value of the work which the translator is permitted to subjoin.

The three volumes now issued, reach, as will be observed, to the Reformation. A fourth, which has not yet appeared in Germany, is to bring down the history to the present time.

Dorchester, August 31, 1836.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

		Page.
§ 1.	The church	1
§ 2.	Definition of ecclesiastical history.—Its departments.—General history of the Christian church . .	2
§ 3.	Preparatory and auxiliary studies . . .	6
§ 4.	Of the sources of ecclesiastical history . . .	8
§ 5.	Use of the sources	9
§ 6.	Selection and arrangement of the materials of ecclesiastical history. Style	10
§ 7.	Importance of the study of ecclesiastical history .	12

FIRST PERIOD.

TO THE SOLE EMPIRE OF CONSTANTINE, BY WHICH THE CHURCH WAS SECURED FROM FARTHER PERSECUTION.

A. D. 1 — 324.

FIRST DIVISION.

TO THE TIME OF HADRIAN. A. D. 1 — 117.

INTRODUCTION.

ON THE RELIGIOUS AND MORAL CONDITION OF THE WORLD IN THE TIME OF OUR SAVIOUR, AND DURING THE FIRST CENTURY.

I. CONDITION OF THE HEATHEN NATIONS.

§ 8.	Heathen nations	15

§ 9. Of the religious and moral character of the ancient nations 16
§ 10. Religion and morals of the Greeks . . . 17
§ 11. Religion and morals of the Romans, to the time of Augustus 18
§ 12. Religious tolerance of the Romans . . . 19
§ 13. Influence of philosophy on the popular religion . . 20
§ 14. Change in the state of religious feeling under the emperors 23

II. CONDITION OF THE JEWS.

§ 15. In Palestine 26
§ 16. Sentiments of the heathen nations towards the Jews 28
§ 17. Condition of the Jews out of Palestine . . . 30
§ 18. Samaritans 32
§ 19. Circumstances of the time considered in reference to Christianity 35

CHAPTER FIRST.

THE LIFE OF JESUS.

§ 20. Chronological data relating to the life of Jesus . . 36
§ 21. Early history of Jesus 38
§ 22. John the Baptist 39
§ 23. Public life and ministry of Jesus . . . 41
§ 24. Supposed contemporary notices of Jesus . . 43

CHAPTER SECOND.

APOSTOLIC AGE, TO THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.

§ 25. Early history of the Christians to the conversion of Paul 46
§ 26. Paul 49
§ 27. History of the other Apostles, and their immediate followers 52
§ 28. Reception of Christianity amongst Jews and Heathen 55
§ 29. Internal relations of the Christian churches . . 56

CHAPTER THIRD.

TIME OF JOHN. A. D. 70—117.

§ 30. Fate of the Judaizing Christians in Palestine . . 61
§ 31. Fate of the Christians in the other provinces of the Roman empire 62
§ 32. Internal history of the church . . . 65
§ 33. Apostolic fathers 67
§ 34. Heretics 69

SECOND DIVISION.

FROM HADRIAN TO SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS. A. D. 117—193.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 35. Of paganism 71
§ 36. Fate of the Jews 72

CHAPTER FIRST.

EXTERNAL HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY.

§ 37. Its progress 73
§ 38. Popular disposition towards Christianity . . 74
§ 39. Opposition of the philosophers to Christianity . . 77
§ 40. Persecutions 78

CHAPTER SECOND.

HERETICS.

§ 41. Jewish Christians 81
§ 42. Gnostics 82
§ 43. (Continuation.) 1. Alexandrian Gnostics . . 84
§ 44. (Continuation.) 2. Syrian Gnostics . . 88
§ 45. (Continuation.) 3. Marcion and his school . . 88
§ 46. Montanists and Alogi 90

CHAPTER THIRD.

INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCH.

§ 47. Orthodox church 93
§ 48. Apologies for Christianity addressed to Heathen and Jews 94
§ 49. Controversy with heretics. — Catholic church. — Canon of the New Testament 96
§ 50. Spurious writings. — Chiliasm 99
§ 51. Platonism 100
§ 52. Customs of the church 102

THIRD DIVISION.

FROM SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS TO THE SOLE EMPIRE OF CONSTANTINE.

A. D. 193—324.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 53. Of paganism 111

CHAPTER FIRST.

EXTERNAL HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY.

§ 54. Disposition of the Heathen towards it 112
§ 55. Conduct of the emperors towards the Christians . 114
§ 56. Spread of Christianity 123

CHAPTER SECOND.

HERETICS.

§ 57. Montanism and the controversy concerning Easter . 124
§ 58. Monarchians 127
§ 59. Manichæans 130

CHAPTER THIRD.

THEOLOGY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

I. In the East.

§ 60. Alexandrian school 134

§ 61. (Continuation.) View of the Alexandrian theology, particularly that of Origen 137
§ 62. (Continuation.) Followers and opposers of Origen 142
§ 63. Other distinguished teachers of the Eastern church . 145

II. Theology in the West.

§ 64. In the West 147

CHAPTER FOURTH.

USAGES OF THE CHURCH.

§ 65. Church usages 151
§ 66. History of the hierarchy 152
§ 67. (Continuation.) Government of the separate churches 156
§ 68. Church discipline 159
§ 69. (Continuation.) Controversies concerning points of church-discipline 163
§ 70. Public worship 167
§ 71. Of celibacy and other ascetic practices . . 169
§ 72. Moral character of Christianity in this Period . 173

SECOND PERIOD.

FROM CONSTANTINE TO THE CONTROVERSIES CONCERNING THE WORSHIP OF IMAGES.

A. D. 324—726.

FIRST DIVISION.

TO THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON. A. D. 324—451.

CHAPTER FIRST.

FINAL STRUGGLE BETWEEN CHRISTIANITY AND PAGANISM.

§ 73. The Christians favored by Constantine and his sons . 178
§ 74. Julian the Apostate 184

§ 75. General toleration till the year 381 . . . 185
§ 76. Suppression of paganism by Theodosius . . 186
§ 77. Paganism entirely suppressed in the East. — Its struggles in the West 189

CHAPTER SECOND.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

§ 78. Introduction 191

I. Arian Controversy.

§ 79. Beginning of the Arian controversy to the synod of Nice (A. D. 325) 192
§ 80. Resistance of the Eusebians to the decrees of the Council of Nice: — till the second Council at Sirmium (A. D. 357) 195
§ 81. Dissensions amongst the Eusebians till the suppression of Arianism (A. D. 381) 198
§ 82. History of the theological sciences during the Arian controversy 207

II. The Origenistic and Pelagian Controversies.

§ 83. Fate of Origen's followers 213
§ 84. Controversies with heretics in the West . . 215
§ 85. Pelagian controversy 218

III. Controversies concerning the Person of Christ.

§ 86. Nestorian controversy 228
§ 87. Eutychian controversy 237
§ 88. Of the authority of the œcumenical synods . . 241

CHAPTER THIRD.

HISTORY OF THE HIERARCHY.

§ 89. Increased consequence of the clergy . . . 242
§ 90. Dependence of the hierarchy on the state . . 247
§ 91. Appointment of patriarchs, especially in the East . 250
§ 92. History of the Roman patriarchs, and of the hierarchy in the West 255

CHAPTER FOURTH.

HISTORY OF MONACHISM.

§ 93. Origin and history of Monachism in the East . . 270
§ 94. Monachism in the West 276
§ 95. Relations of the monks to the clergy . . . 278

CHAPTER FIFTH.

HISTORY OF THE CHANGES IN PUBLIC WORSHIP.

§ 96. Changes in public worship 281
§ 97. New objects of worship 282
§ 98. Of the churches, fasts, and festivals . . . 291
§ 99. Rites and ceremonies 293

CHAPTER SIXTH.

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN MORALS AND MANNERS.

§ 100. History of Christian ethics 296
§ 101. Morals of the clergy 298
§ 102. Moral influence of the clergy on the people at large 301
§ 103. Influence of the church on legislation . . 307

CHAPTER SEVENTH.

REFORMERS.

§ 104. Reformers 308

CHAPTER EIGHTH.

SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

§ 105. In the East 311
§ 106. In the West 312

SECOND DIVISION.

FROM THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON TO THE BEGINNING OF THE MONOTHELETIC CONTROVERSIES, AND THE TIME OF MUHAMMED.

A. D. 451 — 622.

CHAPTER FIRST.

ENTIRE SUPPRESSION OF PAGANISM IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

§ 107. Paganism 314

CHAPTER SECOND.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGICAL OPINIONS.

§ 108. Monophysites 315
§ 109. Controversies under Justinian I. . . . 321
§ 110. History of the Monophysite churches . . 327
§ 111. Semipelagian controversy . . . 328
§ 112. History of the theological sciences . . . 330

CHAPTER THIRD.

HISTORY OF THE HIERARCHY.

§ 113. Privileges of the clergy 334
§ 114. Dependence of the hierarchy on the state . 335
§ 115. History of the patriarchs 335

CHAPTER FOURTH.

HISTORY OF MONACHISM.

§ 116. In the East 345
§ 117. Benedictines 346
§ 118. Relation of the monks to the clergy . . . 348

CHAPTER FIFTH.

HISTORY OF PUBLIC WORSHIP.

§ 119. Public worship . 349

CHAPTER SIXTH.

SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY AND ITS CONDITION WITHOUT THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

I. In Asia and Africa.

§ 120. Christianity 353

II. Amongst the German Nations.

§ 121. German nations 354
§ 122. Hierarchy in the German church . . 355
§ 123. Moral influence of Christianity amongst the German nations 358

III. British Church.

§ 124. British church 361

THIRD DIVISION.

FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE MONOTHELETIC CONTROVERSY, AND FROM THE TIME OF MUHAMMED, TO THE BEGINNING OF THE CONTROVERSY CONCERNING THE WORSHIP OF IMAGES.

A. D. 622—726.

CHAPTER FIRST.

ENEMIES OF THE CHURCH IN THE EAST.

§ 125. In the East 364

CHAPTER SECOND.

HISTORY OF THE GREEK CHURCH.

§ 126. Monotheletic controversy 366
§ 127. Concilium quinisextum 370
§ 128. Fate of Monotheletism 372

CHAPTER THIRD.

HISTORY OF THE WESTERN CHURCH.

§ 129. State of the church in Italy 373
§ 130. State of the church in France and Spain . 376
§ 131. State of the church in the British islands . . 379
§ 132. Spread of Christianity in Germany . . 381

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1.

THE CHURCH.

Kant Religion innerh. der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, S. 140, ff. Stäudlin über den Begriff der Kirche und Kirchengeschichte (in his and Schleusner's Theol. Bibliothek, Th. I. S. 600).

THE Christian church[1] (ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Matth. xvi. 18, ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ, 1 Cor. x. 32, Gal. i. 13.) is a religious-moral society, bound together by a common faith in Christ, and seeking to represent in itself the kingdom of God, which he proclaimed (τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ οὐρανοῦ). This it hopes at some time to see realized, and is striving to become worthy to enter into it.[2] The church bears the same relation to the kingdom of God as the Congregation* of the Israelites (Numb. xx. 4.) to their ideal Theocracy; and as the one is the purified and spiritualized image of the Theocracy, so the other of the Congregation. Differences of opinion, or of usage, early led to a separation of this society into

[1] The word *church* [German *Kirche*, Saxon *circe*, vid. Johnson, and Bingham's Antiq of the Christian Church — Tr.] is with most probability derived from the Greek τὸ κυριακόν. *Walafrid Strabo* (about A. D. 840) de rebus ecclesiasticis c. 7. Quomodo Theotisce domus Dei dicatur (in Melch. Hittorp. de divinis cathol. eccl. officiis varii vetust. Patrum libri, Colon. 1568. fol. p. 395.): Ab ipsis autem Græcis *Kyrch* a Kyrios — et alia multa accepimus. — Sicut domus Dei Basilica i. e. Regia a Rege, sic etiam Kyrica i. e. Dominica a Domino nuncupatur. — Si autem quæritur, qua occasione ad nos vestigia hæc Græcitatis advenerint, dicendum, — præcipue a Gothis, qui et Getæ, cum eo tempore, quo ad fidem Christi, licet non recto itinere, perducti sunt, in Græcorum provinciis commorantes, nostrum i. e. Theotiscum sermonem habuerint. It appears from Ulfilas that in general the Greek names for Christian things were adopted amongst the Goths (see Zahn's Ulfilas. Th. 2. S. 69 ff., also *aikklesion*, translation of ἐκκλησία Phil iii 6, in the Fragments published by Maius). The Greek origin of the word is confirmed also by its being found not only in all the German dialects (Swedish *Kyrka*, Danish *Kirke*, etc.), but also in the dialects of the Sclavonian nations, who were converted by the Greeks (Polish *cerkiew*, Russian *zerkow*, Bohemian *cyrkew*) — Other derivations are from the German word *kueren*, 'to choose,' the Gothic *kelikn*, 'a tower,' etc.

[2] The idea of the church is given us historically, and does not therefore admit of philosophical generalization.

* [See Jahn's Heb. Commonwealth, p. 56. Andover, 1828. — Tr.]

several distinct societies, each of which has almost always assumed to itself exclusively the name of 'the true church,' and stigmatized all opinions but its own as heresy and schism.[3]

If we judge these various divisions of the church, not by their external connexion with the primitive Christians, but by their internal conformity with the principles of the gospel, we cannot allow that any one of them is the perfect representative of that ideal state at which they all alike aim; nor, on the other hand, can we entirely deny the name of a Christian church to any one which professes to be built on the gospel of Christ. They all have so much in common in their religious faith and life, and so much that distinguishes them from all other religious societies, as to justify us in considering them as one whole, and calling this, in a wide sense, THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

§ 2.

DEFINITION OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY. — ITS DEPARTMENTS. — GENERAL HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.*

The object of ecclesiastical history should be to trace carefully the successive steps in the progress of the Christian church; and in such a way as not only to show the actual posture of affairs at each particular period, but also to explain how the various changes have been brought about. The situation of the church at any period depends on its internal and external relations. To the former belongs, first of all, the religious faith, considered as well in its theoretical developement as in its practical influence; then the character of the public religious exercises; and, lastly, the constitution of the church-government. The external relations of the church are its spread, and its relation to the state. Though these various relations are by no means independent of each other, but are developed by a constant mutual action, they can yet be treated of separately; and thus we have

I. The history of the external relations of the church (*External history of the church*), viz.

1. The history of its spread.[1]

---

3 According to the modern distinction, *schism* is the withdrawing from the communion of the church, *heresy* only a deviation from the received doctrine.

1 *Jo. Alb. Fabricii* salutaris lux evangelii toti orbi exoriens, s. notitia propagatorum Christ. sacrorum. Hamburgi. 1731. 4to. — Ph. Christoph Gratianus Versuch einer Geschichte über den Ursprung und die Fortpflanzung des Christenthums in Europa. Tübingen. 1766–1773. 2 Th. 8vo. — The same, Geschichte der Pflanzung des Christenthums in den aus den Trümmern des röm. Kaiserth. entstandenen Staaten Europens. Tübingen, 1778, 1779. 2 Th. 8vo.

* See Royko Einleitung in die christl. Religions- u. Kirchengeschichte. ed. 2. Prag. 1791. 8vo. — Ch. W. Fluegge Einleitung in das Studium und in die Literatur der Rel. und Kirchengeschichte, besonders der christlichen. Gött. 1801. 8vo.

2. History of the relation of church to state.[2]

II. The history of the internal relations of the church (*Internal history of the church*), viz;

1. History of the doctrines of the church.
   a) Their practical influence, or, History of the religious and moral life of Christians in different ages.[3]
   b) Their scientific developement, or, History of the theological sciences.[4]
      History of doctrines (Dogmengeschichte).[5]
      History of ethics.[6]
2. History of church usages and rites.[7]
3. History of the government of the church.[8]

---

2 *Petrus de Marca* dissertationum de concordia sacerdotii et imperii s. de libertatibus ecclesiæ Gallicanæ libb. VIII. ed. Steph. *Baluzius*. Paris. 1663. fol. Amongst the later editions the best is that cum observationibus ecclesiasticis *Justi Henn. Boehmeri* Lips. 1708. fol. — G J. Plancks Geschichte der christlich-kirchlichen Gesellschaftsverfassung. Hannover. 1803 - 1809. 5 Bde. 8vo.

3 This branch of ecclesiastical history is peculiarly difficult, and until very lately has been much neglected. Of earlier works we have only very partial sketches of the life of the primitive Christians, such as those of William Cave, Gottfried Arnold, and Peter Zorn. The history of Morals is interwoven with the history of Christian Ethics (Geschichte der Littenlehre Jesu) by K. F. Stäudlin. Gött. 1799 - 1823. 4 Bde. 8vo. The history of the mode of life amongst Christians is contained in Neander's Derkwuerdigkeiten aus der Geschichte des Christenthums und des christlichen Lebens. Berlin. 1823. ff.

4 Ch. W. Flügge's Geschichte der theol. Wissenschaften. Halle. 1796 - 98. 3 Theile. 8vo. (to the Reformation.) — R. F. Stäudlins Gesch. der theol. Wissenschaften seit der Verbreitung der alten Literatur. Gottingen. 1810 - 11. 2 Th. 8vo.

5 *Dion. Petavii* dogmata theologica. Paris. 1644 - 50. 4 voll., fol. cum præfat. et notis Theophili Alethini (Jo. Clerici.) Amst. 1700. 6 voll. fol. — Wilh. Münschers Handbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte. Marburg. 1797 - 1809. 4 Th. 8vo. (not completed.) — L. Bertholdts Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte. Erlangen. 1822. 2 Bde. 8vo. — Manuals by Chr. Dan. Beck (commentarii historici decretorum rel. christ. Lips. 1801.) J. Chr. W. Augusti (3te Ausg. Leipz. 1820.) u. W. Münscher. (2te Ausg. Marburg. 1819. 8vo.) (Elements of Dogm. History; translated by Dr. Murdock. N. Haven. 1830. 12mo.)

6 Stäudlins Geschichte der Sittenlehre Jesu. (See note 3.) W. M. L. de Wette christliche Sittenlehre, 2ter Theil: Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Sittenlehre, in 2 Hälften. Berlin. 1819 - 21. 8vo. — Stäudlins Monographieen: Gesch. d. Vorstellungen v. der Sittlichkeit des Schauspiels. Gött. 1823. Gesch. d. Vorstell. u. Lehren vom Selbstmorde. Gött. 1824. Gesch. d. Vorstell. u. Lehren v. Eide. Gött. 1824. Gesch. der Vorstell. u. Lehren v. Gebete. Gött. 1824. Gesch. der Lehre v. Gewissen. Halle. 1824. Gesch. d. Vorstell. u. Lehren v. d. Ehe. Gött. 1826. Gesch. d. Vorstell. u. Lehren v. d. Freundschaft. Hannover. 1826. 8vo.

7 *Edm. Martene* de antiquis ecclesiæ ritibus. (3d much improved ed.) Antverp. 1736 - 38. 4 voll. fol. — C. Schöne Geschichtsforschungen über die kirchlichen Gebräuche und Einrichtungen der Christen. Berlin. 1819. ff. bis jetzt 3 Bände. [See note 9. — Tr.]

8 L. Thomassini vetus et nova ecclesiæ disciplina circa beneficia et beneficiarios. Luccæ. 1728. 3 voll. fol. — Plancks Geschichte der christlich-kirchlichen Gesellschaftsverfassung (See note 2.) [Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity. fol. Lond. 1617. — Tr.]

The description of the rites of the church, of its customs, and government, though plainly belonging to the province of history, as embracing always a longer or shorter period, and not confined to a particular point of time, has received the somewhat indefinite name of 'Ecclesiastical Antiquities,' or 'Ecclesiastical Archæology.'[9]

The materials of ecclesiastical history are farther distributed into 'special histories' of particular countries and sects.[10] — But notwithstanding all these divisions it is evident that the history of the several relations of the church, as well as of the church of each particular country, and of every sect, must always be more or less dependent on the history of other relations, countries, or sects. It is the office of the General History of the Christian Church[11] to trace the impor-

---

9 *Jos. Binghami* origines sive antiquitates ecclesiasticæ ex Angl. Lat. redditæ a J. H. Grischovio. Halæ. 1724-38. 11 voll. 4to. (Bingham, Jos., Antiquities of the Church. 3 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1710-11) — J. C. W. Augusti Denkwürdigkeiten aus der christlichen Archäologie. Leipz. 1817. ff.; up to the present time. 8 vols. — Catholic authors: *F. Th. Mamachii* originum et antiquitatum Christianarum libb. XX. Only 4 books have as yet appeared. Romæ. 1749-55 4to. — *J. L. Selvaggii* antiquitatum Christianarum institution. libb. III. in 6 partibus. Neapoli. 1772-74. 8vo. — *A ex. Aur. Pelliccia* de Christ. ecclesiæ primæ, mediæ, et novissimæ ætatis politia libb. VI. Neapoli. 1777. 3 voll. 8vo.: new edition, with notes by *Renzi*, Vercelli, 1778; afterwards often reprinted.

10 Walch's vollständige Historie der Ketzereien, Spaltungen und Religionsstreitigkeiten bis auf die Reformation. 1762. (reaches only to the picture controversy). [In English we have some valuable notices in Lardner's Hist. of Heresies. — Tr.]

11 Works on the general history of the Christian church:

I. By Protestants:

Ecclesiastica historia — — congesta per aliquot studiosos et pios viros in urbe Magdeburga. Basil. 1559-74. 13 voll. fol. (comprehends 13 centuries, commonly called Centuriæ Magdeburgenses.)

J. H. Hottingeri historia ecclesiastica Novi Testamenti. Hanov. et Tiguri. 1655-67. 9 Parts. 8vo. (reaches to the end of the 16th century.)

J. L. Mosheim institutionum historiæ ecclesiasticæ antiquæ et recentioris libb. IV. Helmst. 1755. 4to. Translated into English by Maclaine, 1764. 6 vols. 8vo: and by James Murdock, N. Haven. 1832. 3 vols. 8vo

J. S. Semler historiæ eccles. selecta capita cum epitome canonum, excerptis dogmaticis, et tabulis chronologicis. Halæ. 1773-78. 3 voll. 8vo. (to the end of the 15th century.)

H. Venema institutiones historiæ ecclesiæ Vet. et Novi Testam. Lugd. Batav. 1777-83. 7 parts. 4to. (to the end of the 16th century.)

J. Matth. Schröckh's christl. Kirchengeschichte bis zur Reformation. Leipz. 1768-1803. 35 Th. 8vo. — The same, Kirchengesch. seit der Reformat. Leipz. 1804-10. 2 Th. 8vo. (9th and 10th vols. by H. G. Tzschirner.)

H. P. C. Henkes allgemeine Gesch. der christlichen Kirche fortgesetzt von J. S. Vater. Braunschweig. 1788-1820. 8 Thle. 8vo. (of the 1st and 2d Parts, the 5th ed. 1818-20; of 3d and 4th, the 4th ed. 1806.) As the history since the Reformation is on a more extended plan, Dr. Vater has reduced it to one volume, which forms a continuation of vol. 1st. (Brunswick. 1823.)

J. E. Ch. Schmidts Handbuch der christlichen Kirchengeschichte. Giessen. 1801-20. 6 Theile. (Th. 1-3, 2te Aufl. 1825-26.) reaches to 1216.

A. Neanders allgemeine Geschichte der christl. Religion u. Kirche Bd. 1. Abth. 1 u. 2. Hamburg. 1825, 1826. 8vo. [Bd. 1. Abth 3. Bd. 2. Abth. 1, 2, u. 3. Hamburg. 1825-32. History of the Christian religion and church during the first three centuries, translated from the German of Dr. A. Neander by H. J. Rose. Vol. 1. Lond. 1831. — Tr.]

tant steps in its progress, through all its relations, and in all countries and sects. Of course it has to do with those events only, which have had some influence on this general developement, leaving those of a more local and partial significance to the local or special histories.

Manuals by *J. M. Schröckh* (hist. relig. et eccles. Christ. 1777. 6th ed. cur. Ph. Marheinecke. Berlin. 1818.), L. T. Spittler (Göttingen. 1782. 5th ed. cur. G. J. Planck. 1812.). J. E. Chr. Schmidt (Giessen. 1800. 3d ed. 1826.), W. Münscher (Marburg. 1804. 2d ed. by L. Wachler. 1815. 3d ed. by M. J. H Beckhaus. 1826), K. F. Stäudlin (Hannover. 1806. 4th ed. 1825.), J. T. L. Danz (2 Th. Jena. 1818-26).

J. S. Vaters synchronist. Tafeln der Kirchengeschichte. Halle. 1803. 4th ed. 1825. fol. [Synchronistic Tables of Church History. Boston. 1830. 8vo. Tr.]

II. By Catholics:

Cæs. Baronii Annales Ecclesiastici. Romæ. 1588-1607. 12 vols. fol. reaches to 1198. (The ed. Mogunt. 1601, is corrected by the author himself, and from this all the later editions have been taken) Of the continuations of Baronius the most valued is *Odoricus Raynaldus* Ann. Eccles. Tom. XIII-XXI. Rom. 1646-77. (Tom. XXI was suppressed by authority till A. D. 1689. A new and improved edition of vol. XIII.-XX. was published by the author. Colon. 1693 ss) reaches to 1565. Continued by *Jac. de Laderchio.* Ann. Eccl. T. XXII-XXIV. Rom. 1728-37. including A. D. 1566-71.

Other continuations of Baronius are those of *Abr. Bzovius*, Rom. 1616. Tomi VIII. to 1564 (improved ed. Colon. 1621 ss.), and that of *Henr. Spondanus*, Paris. 1640-41. Tomi II. to 1640. Critiques: *Is. Casauboni* exercitationes XVII. ad Card. Baronii prolegom. Londini. 1614. fol., continued by *Sam. Basnagius:* exercitationes — in quibus Card. Baronii annales ab anno Christi XXXV., in quo Casaubonus desiit, expenduntur. Ultraj. 1692., also 1717. 4to. — *Anton. Pagii* critica historico-chronologica in annales Baronii ed. *Franc. Pagi.* Antverp. (should be Geneva.) 1705., also 1727. T. IV. fol.

Great ed. of *Baronii* annales, *Raynaldi* continuatio, *Pagii* critica, and other smaller writings by *Dom. Ge.* and *Jo. Dom. Mansi.* Lucca. 1738-59. 38 vols. fol.

Natalis Alexander: historia eccles. Vet. et Novi Testamenti. Paris. 1699. 8 voll. fol. (reaches to the end of the 16th century.) — *Claude Fleury* histoire ecclésiastique. Paris. 1691-1720. 20 vols. 4to. (reaches to 1414), continued by *Jean Claude Fabre.* Paris. 1726-40. 16 vols. 4to. (Claude Fleury. Eccl. History to A. D. 870, transl. from the French by H. Herbert. 5 vols. 4to. Lond. 1727.) — *Casp Sacharelli* historia ecclesiastica. Rom. 1772-95. 25 voll. 4to. — Casp. Royko christl. Rel. u. Kirchen-Gesch. Prag. 1789-91. 3 Th. 8vo. — Fr. L. Graf v. Stolberg; Geschichte der Religion Jesu. Hamburg. 1806-19. 15 Bde. 8vo., continued by F. v. Kerz, Th. 16 u. 17 Mainz. 1825, 26. — Th. Katerkamp's Kirchengeschichte (I. Gesch. d. Religion bis zur Stiftung einer allgem. Kirche. Münster. 1819. II. Des ersten Zeitalters der Kirchengesch. erste Abtheil 1823. III. Desselben zweite Abth. 1825. 8vo.) reaches to 411. — J. R. Locherer's Gesch. d christl Rel. u. Kirche. Ravensburg. 1824. ff. 8vo. 3 parts already published. — J. R. Hortig's Handbuch d. christl. Kirchengesch. Bd. I. Landshut. 1826. 8vo. — J. J. Ritter's Handb. d. Kirchengesch. Bd. I. Elberfeld. 1826 8vo.

Manuals by *Matthias Dannenmayr* (institutt. h. e. N T. Viennæ. 1788. ed. 2. 1806. 2 voll.) *Fr Xav. Gmeiner* (epitome h. e. N. T. 2 voll. ed 2. Grätz. 1803) und Ant Michl (Christl. K. G. München. 2 Bde. 1807, 1811. 2te ed. 1811. 1819.)

[Besides the two translations of *Mosheim* abovementioned, of which that by by Dr. Murdock is particularly valuable for the great learning and fidelity displayed in the notes, and the translations of Fleury and Neander, we have in English a translation of *Tillemont's* Eccl. Memoirs of the first six centuries. 2 vols. fol. Lond. 1731-35. *Milner's* History of the Church of Christ. 5 vols. 8vo. *J. Priestley's* General History of the Christian Church to the present time.

§ 3.

PREPARATORY AND AUXILIARY STUDIES.

The following historical studies are so closely connected with that of ecclesiastical history, that some acquaintance with them becomes indispensable to him who would engage in it deeply, and they may therefore be considered as his proper preparatory studies, viz. Political History,[1] General History of the Progress of Mankind,[2] History of Religions,[3] of Philosophy,[4] and of Litera-

---

6 vols. 1780–1803. *G. Campbell's* Lectures on Ecclesiastical History. 2 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1800. *L. Echard's* Ecclesiastical History. 6th ed. 2 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1722. *J. Erskine's* Sketches of Church History and Theological Controversy. 2 vols. 12mo. Edinb. 1790–97. *Rob. Jones's* History of the Christian Church 2 vols. 8vo. Ecclesiastical History in the *Library of Useful Knowledge.* Of all these Mosheim alone is fitted for a general and comprehensive study of the subject of ecclesiastical history. In Jones's Church History may be found a very full account of the Albigenses and Waldenses. The history in the Library of Useful Knowledge is written in a very liberal spirit, and an attractive style, but does not claim to be a complete introduction to the study. — Tr.]

1 Universal History. 60 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1747–63. (translated into German with continuations, 1744–1810). *Wm. Guthrie* and *J. Gray's* General History of the World. 12 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1764–67. (translated into German with continuations. 1765–1808). Ch. D. Beck's Anleitung zur Kentniss der allgemeinen Welt- und Volker-Geshichte. Leipz. 1787–1807. 4 Bde 8vo. (to the discovery of America). C. v. Rotteck's allgemeine Geschichte Freiburg. 1823–27. 8vo. C. F. Schlosser's Weltgeschichte in zusammenhängender Erzählung. 3 Bde. already published, (reaching to A. D. 1300) Frankfort. 1815–24 8vo. [This last work is considered a model in its kind. The 'History of the Revolutions in Europe from the Subversion of the Roman Empire in the West till the Congress of Vienna.' from the French of *C. W. Koch*, Hartford, 1832, 8vo., though a small work, will be found a convenient and useful auxiliary to the study of church history. — Tr.]

2 J. G. Herders Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit. Riga und Leipzig. 1784–91. 4 Theile. 8vo. (Outlines of a Philosophy of the History of Man. Lond. 1800. 2 vols 8vo.) — J. G Grubers Gesch. des menschl. Geschlechts a. d. Gesichtspunkte der Humanität. Leipzig. 1806–7. 2 Bde. 8vo.

3 *Bernh. Picard* cérémonies et coutumes religieuses de tous les peuples du monde. Amsterd. 1723–53. 9 voll. fol. — *F. H. St. Delaunaye* histoire générale et particulière des religions et du culte de tous les peuples du monde. Paris. 1791 2 T. 4to. — Ch. Meiners allg. krit Geschichte der Religionen. Hannover. 1806–7. 2 Bde. 8vo. — F Mayer Geschichte aller Religionen, als mythologisches Taschenbuch. Weimar. 1811. 8vo. — [*Wm Turner's* History of all Religions in the World from the Creation down to the present time. Lond. 1695. 8vo. *J. Edwards's* Hist ry of all the Dispensations and Methods of Religion. 2 vols. 8vo Lond. 1699. — *Hannah Adams's* View of Religions. 8vo. Bost. 1801 — *Wm. Hurd's* New Universal History of the Religious Rites, Ceremonies, and Customs of the whole World. 1812. 4to. — *W. Jones's* Dict. of Religious Opinions. Lond. 1817. 12mo. — *D. Williams's* Hist Sketch of the Doctrines and Opinions of the various Religions of the World. Lond. 1818. 12mo. — Tr.]

4 *Jac. Bruckeri* historia critica philosophiæ. Lips. 1741–67. 6 Bde. 4to. — D. Tiedemanns Geist der speculativen Philosophie Marb. 1791–97. 6 Bde. 8vo. — J. G. Buhle's Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Philosophie.

ture,[5] especially the literature of Christian nations, and of all those which have in any way come in contact with Christianity. The studies auxiliary to that of Ecclesiastical History, on the other hand, are Ecclesiastical Philology,[6] Ecclesiastical Chronology,[7] Ecclesiastical Geography and Statistics,[8] and Ecclesiastical Diplomacy.[9]

Göttingen. 1796–1804. 8 Theile. 8vo. — The same. Gesch. der neuern Philosophie seit der Epoche der Wiederherstellung der Wissensch. Ebend. 1800–1805. 6 Bde. 8vo. — W. G. Tennemanns Geschichte der Philosophie. Leipzig. 1798–1820. 11 Bde. 8vo. — [Tennemann's Hist. of Philosophy. Lond. 1832. 8vo. — Tr.]

5 L. Wachlers allgem. Gesch. der Literatur. 2te Umarbeitung. Frankf. a. M. 1822–24. 4 Theile. gr. 8vo. — J. G. Eichhorns Geschichte der Literatur von ihrem Ursprunge bis auf die neuesten Zeiten. Göttingen. 1805–10. 1–3 Bd. 1te Abth. — [F. Schlegel. Lect. on the Hist. of Literature, from the German. 2 vols. 8vo. Phil. 1818.— Tr.]

6 *J. C. Suiceri* thesaurus ecclesiasticus e patribus Græcis: 2te ed. Amst. 1728. 2 voll. fol.

Also C. L. Baueri Glossarium Theodoreteum affixed to Schütz's edition of Theodoret (Halle, 1774), and the Index Latinitatis Tertullianeæ (by Schütz and Windorf) affixed to Semler's edition of Tertullian (Halle, 1776), — are of considerable value

For the modern Greek and Latin generally *C. du Fresne* Glossarium ad scriptores mediæ et infimæ Græcitatis. Lugd. 1688 2 tom fol. — *C. du Fresne* glossar. ad scriptores mediæ et infimæ Latinitatis, edit. nova operâ et stud. Monachorum ord. S Bened. Paris. 1733–36. 6 voll. fol. — *P Carpentier* glossar. novum ad scriptores med. ævi cum Latinos tum Gallicos. Paris. 1766. 4 voll fol. — *Glossar.* manuale ad scriptores mediæ et infimæ Latinitatis, (by J. C. Adelung) Hal. 1772–84. 6 voll. 8vo. — Also all glossaries for the dialects of the middle ages.

7 See the general works on chronology: *J. C. Gatterer* Abriss der Chronologie. Göttingen. 1777. 8vo. — L'art de vérifier les dates etc., par un religieux Bénédictin. Paris. 1750 3 voll. 4to. The last edition, by *M. Viton de Saint-Allais*, is in two parts: L'art etc. avant l'ère chrétienne, 5 Tomes; and L'art etc. depuis la naissance de notre Seigneur, 18 Tomes. Paris. 1818 & 19. 8vo. — [*John Blair's* Chronology and History of the World fol Lond 1756. — *James Playfair's* System of Chronology fol. Edin. 1784. For the first ages we have also *W. Cave's* Chronology of the First Three Ages of the Christian Church, at the end of his Apostolici. fol. Lond. 1716 — *W. Whiston's* Inquiry into the Chronology, Doctrine, and Discipline of the Primitive Church. Lond. 1742. 8vo. — Tr.]

Besides the usual chronological distinctions, the following eras are important for the study of church history: *Æra contractionum* or *Seleucidarum*, which begins B. C. 312, formerly the most common in the East. — *Æra Hispanica*, which begins B. C. 38, and was used in Spain until the 14th century, and in Portugal till the year 1415. — *Æra Diocletiana*, or *Æra Martyrum*, which begins 29th August, A. D 284, adopted in the Roman empire after its conversion, and still in use amongst the Copts, though they reckon from the year 276. — *Cyclus indictionum*, from the 25th Sept 312. embracing 15 years. (The Popes from the time of Pelagius II. (578–590) make use of this Cyclus, but begin from the 1st Jan. B. C. 3.) — *Æra Constantinopolitana*, from the creation, which was fixed by the sixth general council (A. D. 681) on the 1st Sept. B. C. 5508. This was in use amongst the Russians till the year 1700, and is still used by the Greeks.*

8 *Caroli a S. Paulo* geographia sacra s. notitia antiqua diœceseon omnium veteris ecclesiæ, cur. *J. Clerico.* Amstel. 1703. fol. — Atlas antiquus sacer, ecclesiasticus et profanus — collectus ex tabulis geographicis *Nic. Sansonis* —

* *Koch*, as above cited.

§ 4.

OF THE SOURCES OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

The sources of ecclesiastical history, as of all other history, may be reduced to these three: Testimony, Documents, and Monuments. To the first belong not only the earliest Records of events in the church, so far as we possess them,[1] and the Biography of distinguished individuals in the history of Christianity,[2] but also other works of Christian writers, especially their theological writings,[3] and even

---

tabulas emendavit *J. Clericus.* Amstel. 1705. fol. — *Fr. Spanhemii* Geograph. sacra et eccles. (in opp. T. I Lugd. Bat. 1701.) — *Bingham* origg. eccl. lib. IX.

Also: Ch. Kruse's Atlas zur Geshichte aller europäischen Länder und Staaten von ihrer ersten Buvölkerung an bis zum Jahr 1816. 3te Ausg. Leipzig u. Halle. 1822. 4 Hefte. fol. — Historischer Handatlas. Weimar 2 Lieferungen. Die 2te zur Geschichte des Mittelalters auf 4 Charten und 17 Cartons von Hauptm. Benicken. 1821. [Better than either of these is *Lavoisne's* Historical, Geographical, and Chronological Atlas. Phil. 1821. fol. — Tr.]

For the later history: K F. Stäudlins kirchl. Geographie und Statistik. Tübingen. 1804. 2 Theile. 8vo.

9 Vid. the general works on Diplomatics: *J. Mabillon* de re diplomatica. ed. 2 Paris. 1709. Supplem. 1704. — Nouveau traité de diplomatique par deux relig. Bénédictins de la Congr de St Maur. (*Tonstain* et *Tassin*). Paris. 1750 – 65. 6 voll 4to. — Gatterers Abriss der Diplomatik. Göttingen. 1798. 8vo. — K. T. G. Schönemanns vollst. System der allgemeinen Diplomatik. Hamb. 1801. 2 Bde. 8vo. [The art of judging of ancient charters or diplomas, and discriminating the true from the false, is called *Diplomatics.* Koch, p. 19 — Tr.]

1 Vid. *C. Sagittarii* introductio in historiam ecclesiasticam. Jenæ. 1718. Tom. I. 4to., with the Supplements in Tom. II. (curante *J. A. Schmidio.* 1718) p. 1 – 706. — Ch. W. F. Walchs Grundsätze der zur Kirchenhistorie des R. T. nöthigen Vorbereitungslehren und Bücherkenntniss Göttingen. 1773. 8vo. — Schröckhs Kirchengeschichte. Bd. 1. S. 141. ff. — C. F Stäudlin's Geschichte u. Literatur der Kirchengeschichte, herausgeg. v. J. T. Hemsen. Hannover 1827. 8vo. (comp. the works cited in note 3.)

2 The histories of Martyrs and Saints in particular are very numerous, but to be used with great caution.

Acta Sanctorum, quotquot toto orbe coluntur. Antverp. 1643 – 1794. 53 vols. fol., a work of the Jesuits. *Jo. Bolandus* (from whom the publishers are called Bollandists). *Godf Henschenius*, *Dan. Papebrochius*, and others, arranged according to the days of the month. The 53d vol. is to the 6th of October. [See also Fox's Book of the Martyrs. 3 vols. fol. Lond. 1631 – 32. — Tr.]

3 Vid. Nouvelle bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques — par *L. Ellies du Pin.* Paris. 1686 – 1714. gr. 8vo., with the continuations: bibliothèque des auteurs séparés de la communion de l'église Romaine, du 16 et 17 siècle par *Ell. du Pin* Paris. 1718 – 19. 2 voll.; and the bibliothèque des aut. ecclés. du 18 siècle par *Claude Pierre Goujet.* Paris. 1736 – 37. 3 vols. 8vo. Comp. Remarques sur la biblioth. — de Mr. du Pin par *Matthieu Petitdidier.* Paris. 1691 ss. 3 Tom. 8vo. and Critique de la biblioth. — de Mr. du Pin — par *Rich. Simon.* Paris. 1730. 4 Tom. 8vo.

Histoire des auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques par *R. Ceillier.* Paris. 1729. ff. 23 voll. 4to. (reaches to the 15th century.) — *W. Care* scriptorum ecclesiasticorum historia literaria. Oxon 1740 Basil. 1741. 2 voll. fol. (to the Reformation.) — *Casp. Oudini* commentarius de scriptoribus ecclesiast. antiquis. Lips. 1722. 3 voll. fol. (reaches to A. D. 1460.)

many works of Infidels, who have in some way come in contact with Christians.

Of the Documents the most important are the Laws of different States, so far as they have exerted any influence on Christianity, or have been influenced by it; the Acts and Ordinances of Ecclesiastical Councils;[4] the Official Letters of the Heads of the Churches, particularly of the Popes;[5] the Rules of the various Monastic Orders;[6] and the Confessions of Faith, Liturgies, &c.[7] By Monuments we understand Churches, Monuments of the Dead, Inscriptions, and other works of art, which the church has called into being.

§ 5.

USE OF THE SOURCES.

The aim of the ecclesiastical historian should be to get the facts in the history of the church directly from the Sources, and to exhibit them in their true character and bearing, as well as in their proper connexion. He has need of Historical Criticism to enable him to judge of the genuineness, integrity, and credibility of his Sources,

---

J. A. Fabricii bibliotheca ecclesiastica. Hamb. 1718. fol. Ejusd. biblioth. latina mediæ et infimæ ætatis. Hamb. 1734–46. 6 voll. 8vo. (continued by *Mansi*. Patav. 1754 3 voll. 4to.) Also in Fabricii biblioth. græca (Hamb. 1705 seq. Voll. XIV. 4 ed. nova variorum curis emendatior curante *G. Ch. Harless*. Hamb. 1790–1809. Voll. XII. 4to. not completed), and Biblioth. latina (ed. 4. Hamb. 1722. 3 tomi, 8vo. auct. ed. *J. A. Ernesti*. Lips. 1773–74. 3 tom. 8vo.) may be found much useful information on this subject. *C. T. G. Schönemanni* Biblioth. hist. literaria Patrum Latin. a Tertulliano usque ad Gregor. M. Tomi II. Lips. 1792–94. 8vo., is a continuation of the latter.

Collections: *Magna Bibliotheca* vett. Patrum. — — — Paris. 1654. 17 tomi, fol. — *Maxima Bibliotheca* vett. Patrum. — — — Lugdun. 1677. 27 tomi, fol. — *Andr. Gallandii* Biblioth. vett. Patrum. — — — Venetiis. 1765. 55. 14 tomi, fol.

4 Chr. W. F. Walch Entw. einer vollständigen Geschichte der Kirchenversammlungen. Leipzig. 1759. 8vo. Sagittarianæ introductionis in histor. eccl. Tom. II. curante J. A. Schmidio. (Jenæ. 1718.) p. 707.

Decrees of Councils: Conciliorum omnium collectio *Regia*. Paris. 1644. 37 voll. fol. — Sacrosancta Concilia — stud. *Ph. Labbei* et *Gab. Cossarti*. Paris. 1672. 18 voll. fol. (with a suppl. volume by *Baluzius*. Paris. 1683.) — Conciliorum collectio Regia maxima stud. *J. Harduini*. Paris. 1715. 12 vols. fol. — Sacrosancta Concilia — curante *Nicol. Coleti*. Venet. 1728 seq. 23 voll. fol. (with the supplement of *J. Dom. Mansi*. Lucc. 1748. 6 voll. fol.) — Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio. Cur. *J. D. Mansi*. Florent. et Venet. 1759 seq. 31 voll. fol.

5 *Bullarium Romanum.* — Luxemb. 1727. 19 voll. fol. Bullarum amplissima collectio op. *Car. Coquelines*. Rom. 1739. 28 voll. fol.

6 *Lucæ Holstenii* codex regularum monasticarum. (Rom. 1661. 3 voll. 4to.) auctus a *Mar. Brockie*. Aug. Vind. 1759. 6 voll. fol.

7 *J. A. Assemanni* codex liturgicus ecclesiæ universæ. Rom. 1749. 13 voll. 4to. — *L. A. Muratorii* liturgia Romana vetus. Venet. 1748. 2 voll. fol. — *Eus. Renaudot* liturgiarum orientalium collectio. Paris. 1716. 2 voll. 4to.

not only in general, but in each particular case;[1] and he must be the more watchful in this part of his duty for the reason that in this, more than in any other department of historical investigation, the truth is liable to be distorted through ignorance and credulity, through narrow-mindedness and party-spirit, through a wish to accommodate it to certain ends, or even through intentional dishonesty. And when it happens (which in truth is not seldom) that his Sources afford no light whatever, or only mislead him, he must resort to Historical Conjectures, which may sometimes be so supported by the connexion of events, analogy, the character of the time and of individuals, and even by the tenor of the very statements he judges to be false, as to fall little short of certainty; though often perhaps hardly more than possibilities.

The ecclesiastical historian must lay aside all partiality and party interest, and as far as is possible free himself from the peculiarities of his time. On the other hand, without a truly religious spirit he cannot hope to penetrate into the inward character of the events he exhibits; it being universally true that he can never rightly understand the state of another's mind, who cannot reproduce it in his own. Only such an one will be able to discover where the Christian spirit is wholly wanting, where it is used only as a mask, and where a different spirit has usurped its place; whilst he will not fail to recognise it, even in forms wholly foreign to the spirit of his own age.

§ 6.

SELECTION AND ARRANGEMENT OF THE MATERIALS OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY. STYLE.

As the Church seeks to represent in itself the 'Kingdom of God' (§ 1.), it is the object of the History of the Church to show how far this end has been attained. But the idea of the Kingdom of God has been very different at different times. On the form which it assumed at any particular period, and the leading notions therefrom arising, depends the Ecclesiastical character of the time. This it is the part of the Ecclesiastical historian to lay before his readers, to trace its developement, show its peculiarities, and explain its relations to the people and the government. By these considerations he is guided in the choice of his materials, selecting from them only such as are of general importance, and leaving all that is individual or local to the histories of particular sects or countries.

---

[1] *Ernesti* de fide historica recte æstimanda (in his Opusculis philologico-criticis, ed. II. Lugd. Bat. 1776. p. 64 seq.) — *Griesbachii* diss. de fide hist. ex ipsa rerum quæ narrantur natura judicanda (in his Opusc. acad. ed. Gabler. Jenæ. 1824. Vol. I. p. 167 seq.)

In the disposition of materials, the old methods of chronological arrangement, either according to years, or centuries, have been wisely forsaken. For these the division into Periods has been universally substituted, though in the choice of these periods there is a great variety. In the present work Four Periods are laid down: the *first* to the time of Constantine, — History of the Church under oppression: the *second* to the beginning of the picture-controversy, — History of Christianity as the prevailing religion of the state: the *third* to the Reformation, — History of the Papal power in its predominance: the *fourth*, History of Protestantism.[1] The materials of each period may be arranged either chronologically, or according to departments answering to the various relations of the church (§ 2.). Either method, if used exclusively, has its disadvantages. By the chronological arrangement, things which belong together are too widely separated, and the connexion is broken: whilst in the other mode of arrangement, when the periods are large, the influence of the separate relations on each other becomes indistinct, and the difficulty of taking a general view of any one point of time is much increased. It is desirable therefore to unite if possible the advantages of both methods, and to avoid their disadvantages. Now though each period has its decided ecclesiastical character, yet in different parts of the period this character undergoes various modifications, and thus justifies a further division. At first the materials of these smaller divisions are best arranged *chronologically*, until the internal relations of the church are developed, when these may be made use of for our purpose. And some one or more of them being always found to have been peculiarly developed, so as to exert an influence upon all the rest, it seems most suitable to be guided by this in our arrangement, and to dispose the history of the different relations of the church in these minor periods according to their *relative importance and influence on the whole.*

Periods of Church History.

The Style of ecclesiastical history should be worthy of the subject. It is one in which our moral and religious feelings can never be uninterested. Whilst, therefore, the examples of moral greatness it exhibits, awaken our admiration, the errors, whose progress it traces, excite our compassion, and the unworthy aims and motives it lays open, arouse our indignation, it can never offer a fit subject for derision or ridicule.

---

1 The following epochs have been used by different historians for the purpose of marking their periods; the destruction of Jerusalem, A. D. 70; — the accession of Constantine, A. D. 306, or the Council of Nice, 325; — Gregory the Great, 604, or Mohammed, 622; — Boniface, the Apostle of the Germans, 715, or the beginning of the picture-controversy, 725; — Charlemagne, 800; — Gregory VII, 1073; — Removal of the papal residence to Avignon, 1305; — Reformation, 1517; — Founding of the University of Halle, 1693.

§ 7.

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.*

The history of the Christian church must be of universal interest, as forming so important a part of the religious history of mankind. To the Christian this interest is heightened by the opportunity it affords him of tracing the various changes through which Christianity has passed, with their causes and effects; thus enabling him to distinguish what is original and essential from what is only accessory and unimportant. To the theologian, whose study is Christianity, it must for this same reason be indispensable.[1] It is of importance to the general student from its intimate connexion with the history of learning, of philosophy, of ethics, and the arts: and that without it no one can gain a thorough knowledge of Ecclesiastical Law, or the laws of Christian States, is sufficiently manifest.[2]

---

[1] Riemeyers Abhandl. über die hohe Wichtigkeit u. die zweck-mässige Methode eines fortgesetzten Studiums der Religions- und Kirchengeschichte für prakt. Religionslehrer (prefixed to Fuhrmann's Handwörterbuch d. christl. Rel. und Kirchengesch. Bd. 1. Halle. 1826. 8vo.) — *J. A. Ernesti* de theologiæ historicæ et dogmaticæ conjungendæ necessitate (in his Opusc. theol. p. 565).

[2] *J. H. Boehmer* diss. de necessitate et utilitate stud. hist. ecclesiast. in juris ecclesiastici prudentia (in the observatt. sell. ad Pet. de Marca libr. de concordia sacerdotii et imperii. Francof. 1708. fol.)

* *J. J. Griesbach* de historiæ ecclesiasticæ nostri seculi usibus sapienter accommodatæ utilitate. Jen. 1776. 4to. (in his Opusc. acad. ed. Gabler. Vol. I. p. 318.)

FIRST PERIOD.

TO THE SOLE EMPIRE OF CONSTANTINE, BY WHICH THE CHURCH WAS SECURED FROM FARTHER PERSECUTION.

A. D. 1—324.

SOURCES.

I. The Scriptures of the NEW TESTAMENT.

II. ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORIANS. Fragments of *Hegesippus* (about the year 170), ὑπομνήματα τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πραξέων (with a Commentary in *Routh* reliq. sacr. Vol. I. p. 187 seq.).

Eusebius (Bishop of Cæsarea † about 340) Eccl. History in 10 Books[1]) ed. H. Valesius. Par. 1659. fol. (an imperfect reprint. Mogunt. 1672). ed. II. 1677. (Reprinted. Amstel. 1695.) fol. — In a smaller form, ed. F. A. Stroth. Hal. 1779. Tom. I. 8vo. and E. Zimmermann. PP. II. Frankfort on the Main. 1822. 8vo. — The Latin translation of the Eccl. Hist. of Eusebius by Rufinus (about the year 400) in 9 Books, with the continuation of the same in 2 Books, (of which work there were many editions in the 15th and 16th centuries, but none since excepting that of Petr. Thom. Cacciari, Romæ. Tomi II. 1740–41. 4to. — the first critical edition) is rather a work on Eusebius than a translation of him, but offers most valuable aids for the understanding of the original. — The Eccl. History of Eusebius is usually accompanied in the various editions by a work which belongs here, viz. his εἰς τὸν βίον τοῦ μακαρίου Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ βασιλέως λόγοι δ'.[2]

---

1 For a defence of the credibility of Eusebius against Scaliger, Baronius, Masch (Abh. v. d. Grundsprache d. Evangel. Matth. Halle. 1755. p. 191.), Gibbon, and Semler, see *J. Moeller* de fide Eusebii Cæsar. Hafniæ. 1813. 8vo. (reprinted in Stäudlins und Tzschirners Archiv für Kirchengeschichte. Bd. 3. St. 1) *J. T. L. Danz* de Eusebio Cæs. ejusque fide hist. recte æstimanda. P. I. Jenæ. 1815. 8vo. *Ch. A. Kessner* comm. de Eusebii auctoritate et fide diplomatica. Götting. 1817. 4to. *H. Reuterdahl* de fontibus hist. Eccles. Eusebianæ. Londini Gothor. 1826. 8vo. [See *Waddington's* Hist. of the Church, in Library of Useful Knowledge. Ch. vi. p. 86. — Tr.]

2 The doubts concerning the authenticity of these books, brought forward by *Jac. Gothofredus* (diss. ad Philostorg. hist. eccl. lib. VII. c. 3), and *Chr. Sandius* (de scriptt. eccl. p. 92), are satisfactorily answered in *J. A. Bosii* Exercit. posterior de Pontificatu max. Imp. Rom. c. 8. § 5. *M. Hankius* de Byzantin. rerum scriptoribus græcis, § 174. *Balth. Bebelii* antiquitt. eccl. T. I. p. 213. In reference to the historical character of the work, we find Eusebius characterized by Socrates (hist. eccl. I. c. 1.) as τῶν ἐπαίνων τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τῆς πανηγυρικῆς ὑψηγορίας τῶν λόγων μᾶλλον ὡς ἐν ἐγκωμίῳ φροντίσας, ἢ περὶ τοῦ ἀκριβῶς περιλαβεῖν τὰ γενόμενα.

III. All the CHRISTIAN WRITERS of this period. The Fragments of those no longer extant are collected in: *J. E. Grabe* spicilegium SS. Patrum et hæreticorum I et II sæculi. Oxon. 1698. 2 tom. 8vo. — *M. Jos. Routh* reliquiæ sacræ, sive auctorum fere jam perditorum secundi tertiique sæculi fragmenta, quæ supersunt. Oxonii. 1814 - 18. 4 voll. 8vo.

IV. HISTORIES OF THE MARTYRS. *Theod. Ruinart* Acta primorum Martyrum sincera et selecta. Edit. 2. Amstelod. 1713. fol. (ed. *Bern. Galura.* August. Vindel. 1802 - 3. P. III. 8vo.) [Fox's Book of the Martyrs. — Tr.]

V. DETACHED PASSAGES OF PROFANE WRITERS. — viz. Josephus, Suetonius, Tacitus, Pliny the Younger, Scriptores historiæ Augustæ, Dio Cassius, etc., collected in *Nath. Lardner's* collection of the Jewish and Heathen testimonies of the Christian religion. Lond. 1764 - 67. 4 voll. 4to.

Works on the History of this Period.

Sebastian le Nain de Tillemont mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles, justifiées par les citations des auteurs originaux. Paris. 1693 - 1712. 16 Parts. 4to., to the year 513. [Tillemont's Eccl. Memoirs of the first six centuries, from the French. Lond. 1731. 2 vols. fol. — Tr.] — *Joh. Laur. Moshemii* commentarii de rebus christianorum ante Constantinum Magn. Helmst. 1753. 4to. — *Joh. Sal. Semleri* commentarius hist. de antiquo Christ. statu. Halæ. 1771 - 72. T. 2. — *Ejusd.* observatt. novæ, quibus historia christianorum studiosius illustratur usque ad Const. M. Halæ. 1784. 8vo.

On the Spread of Christianity and the Persecutions.

Ed. Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, chap. 15 and 16. [See *Bp. Watson's* Reply. — Tr.] — J. B. Lüderwald Ausbreitung der christl. Religion. Helmst. 1788. 8vo. — J. Andreä Entwickelung der natürlichen Ursachen, welche die schnelle Ausbreit. d. Christenth. beförderten. Helmst. 1792. 8vo.

Chr. Kortholt de persecutionibus ecclesiæ primævæ. Kiloni. 1689. 4to. — *C. W. F. Walch* de persecutionibus Christian. (Nov. Comment. Soc. Goett. T. II.) — *J. G. F. Papst* de ipsorum Christianorum culpa in vexationibus motis a Romanis. 3 Progr. Erlangen. 1789 - 90. 4to. — *C. D. A. Martini* persecutiones Christianorum sub imperatoribus Romanis, causæ earum et effectus. Bostochii. 1802 - 3. comm. III.

FIRST DIVISION.

TO THE TIME OF HADRIAN. A. D. 1—117.

J. L. Moshemii institutiones historiæ Christianæ majores sæc. 1. Helmst. 1739. 4to.—J. G. Semler's neue Versuche die Kirchenhistorie des ersten Jahrhunderts aufzuklären. Leipz. 1788. 8vo. (J. A. Starck's Geschichte der christlichen Kirche des ersten Jahrhunderts. Berlin. 1779. 3 Bde. 8vo.)

INTRODUCTION.

ON THE RELIGIOUS AND MORAL CONDITION OF THE WORLD IN THE TIME OF OUR SAVIOUR, AND DURING THE FIRST CENTURY.

I.

CONDITION OF THE HEATHEN NATIONS.

J. Nitzch über den Religionsbegriff der Alten, in den Theol. Studien u. Kritiken. Bd. 1. S. 227 ff. 725 ff.—F. V. Reinhard's Versuch über der Plan, den der Stifter der christl. Religion zum Besten der Menschheit entwarf. Witt. 1781. 4th. ed. 1798. 8vo. [Plan of the Founder of Christianity. Andover. 1831. 12mo.]—A. Tholuck über das Wesen u. den sittl. Einfluss des Heidenthums (in Neander's Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Geschichte des Christenthums u. des christlichen Lebens, in Bd. 1. Berlin. 1823.)—Neander's Kirchengeschichte, Bd. 1. Abth. 1. S. 4. [Hist. of the Church, vol. I. Introd. pp. 3-31. Lond. 1831.]—See especially Der Fall des Heidenthums, by Dr. H. G. Tschirner. Bd. 1. S. 13 ff. [In English literature we may refer to *J. Leland's* Advantage and Necessity of the Christian Revelation. 2 vols. 4to. Lond. 1764. *Daniel Whitby's* Necessity and Usefulness of the Christian Revelation. Lond. 1705. *Wm. Warburton's* Divine Legation. Vol. I. Book II. § 4.—Tr.]

§ 8.

In the first century the Roman empire embraced the whole civilized world, and almost the whole known world; little being known beyond its limits except the German nations in the North, and the Parthians in the East. In the Western portion of this vast empire the language and manners of the Romans soon became prevalent, but

in the Eastern the Greek always retained the ascendency it had won by the conquests of Alexander, and under the emperors began to gain ground even at Rome.[1] It is easily seen how much the union of so many nations under one government, and the universal prevalence of one language, must have facilitated the spread of the Christian religion.

§ 9.

OF THE RELIGIOUS AND MORAL CHARACTER OF THE ANCIENT NATIONS.

The influence of Polytheism is necessarily unfavorable to the moral progress of those who profess it. The Infinite Divinity being divided into parts, their Deities can no longer be perfect, but must partake more or less of the weakness of humanity. The character of each nation, its vices as well as its virtues, will be exhibited in its Gods, and it is plain that such a religion can never exalt men to a higher point of moral excellence. There is only an external connexion between them and their Gods, and their religion consists entirely in certain rites, without interfering either with theological speculation (so long as it leaves these rites untouched), or with moral sentiment. Such human Deities are of course honored, pleased, and propitiated like the mortals they resemble, and to this end virtue is not necessary so much as shrewdness. They can never inspire respect or love, but only fear; and their worship is a kind of barter, in which man brings his homage and his offerings, and expects mercy, protection, and all other blessings in return. This general character of Polytheism may be traced in every Heathen religion which was in the world at the coming of our Saviour. A mythology, partially at least impure, sanctioned many vices by the example of the Gods; whilst the worship of more than one Deity consisted in acts confessedly immoral. Thus the worship of Bel at Babylon, of Amun at Thebes, and of Aphrodite at Cyprus, Corinth, and many other places, consisted in *lewdness*;[1] and the worship of several other

---

1 Cicero pro Archia, c. 10: Græca leguntur in omnibus fere gentibus, Latina suis finibus, exiguis sane, continentur. From Cicero's letters to Atticus, and the letters of Augustus in Suetonius (Claudius, c. 4.), it may be seen how general the use of the Greek had become in familiar conversation. Juvenal, Satyr. VI. v. 185, speaking of the Roman ladies, says:

> Nam quid rancidius, quam quod se non putat ulla
> Formosam, nisi quæ de Tusca Græcula facta est?
> — — — — — —
> Hoc sermone pavent, hoc iram, gaudia, curas,
> Hoc cuncta effundunt animi secreta: quid ultra?
> Concumbunt græce.

1 *Clemens Alex.* cohort. ad gentes, cap. 2. *Arnobii* disputatt. adv. gentes, lib. V. **Tholuck**, as above cited, S. 171 ff.

Deities was in a high degree calculated to excite the sensual passions.[2] *Human victims* were offered, in some places as yearly expiations, and everywhere in case of any extraordinary danger, to propitiate the offended Deities.[3] Religious motives were valued only for their influence in binding men to the discharge of their duties *as citizens;*[4] and if more elevated moral views are found amongst the Greeks and Romans, they may be traced, not to their religion, but to their natural elevation of character.[5] In general, there was wanting a deep feeling of the dignity of human nature and its rights; and in its place we find a short-sighted national prejudice, and contempt for every thing foreign, cherished and kept alive by the religion of the land, which was, as above observed, only the expression of the national character. Hence the shocking treatment of slaves.[6] And hence it was, that, if ever the national pride was humbled by defeat and subjection, the people lost all self-respect, and sunk at once into the most abject slavery. — The almost exclusive regard for political virtues among the Greeks and Romans operated to degrade *Woman* from her proper place in society;[7] whilst in the East she was sunk still lower by the practice of polygamy.

§ 10.

RELIGION AND MORALS OF THE GREEKS.

In the Gods of the Greeks we meet on every hand the national characteristics. Their intelligence, their subtilty, their skill, their physical strength and beauty, are all imaged forth and idealized in their Deities. But this is all; and with the exception of a few politi-

---

2 Tholuck, as above cited, S. 143 ff.

3 Tholuck, S. 221 ff. According to *Porphyry*, de abstinent. carnis, II. c. 56, human sacrifices were everywhere discontinued under Hadrian: but in his time it was still customary at Rome to offer annually a human victim to Jupiter Latialis (about A. D. 280). *Lactantius* (about A. D. 300) divin. institt. 1. c. 21: Latialis Jupiter etiam nunc sanguine colitur humano. Comp. *Lamb. Bos*, *Heydenreich*, *Pott* ad 1 Cor. iv. 13.

4 *Cicero de legibus*, II. c. 7: Utiles esse autem opiniones has, quis neget, cum intelligat, quam multa firmentur jurejurando; quantæ salutis sint fœderum religiones; quam multos divini supplicii metus a scelere revocarit; quamque sancta sit societas civium inter ipsos, diis immortalibus interpositis tum judicibus, tum testibus.

5 Such is the opinion of *Cicero de fin.* II. c. 25, speaking of Epicurus and his philosophy.

6 See Tholuck, S. 197 ff. under the head of Gladiators. — As late as the time of Claudius it was necessary to make laws against the exposure or murder of sick slaves. (Sueton. in Claud. c. 25.)

7 Tholuck, S. 203 ff.

cal virtues,[1] we look in vain in the Greek mythology for any thing of a moral tendency. There was hardly a vice for which it did not offer an excuse in the example of some God; so that even their own wise men acknowledged its pernicious influence.[2] After their subjection to a foreign yoke, therefore, when national honor, love of country, and patriotism had lost their actuating power, we find the Greeks in a state of the deepest moral degradation; for their religion, being hardly any thing more than a luxury of art, but too often destitute of all claim to a moral character, had no power to elevate a humbled people above the misfortunes of their external condition. How much cultivation of taste and understanding was preferred to purity and virtue, is seen in the great distinction conferred on accomplished courtesans, who alone of their sex seem to have attended at all to the cultivation of the intellect. — Nor is it true, as some have thought,[3] that the *Mysteries* taught an esoteric religion of a different character. All they offered seems to have been a secret mythology, supplementary to that of the uninitiated, certain secret rites to be observed in worshipping the Gods, directions for the purification of those admitted to the Mysteries, and amongst these last, it is true, a few moral precepts, — all with the purpose of propitiating the peculiar favor of the Gods.

§ 11.

RELIGION AND MORALS OF THE ROMANS, TO THE TIME OF AUGUSTUS.

Vid. C. D. Beck über den Einfluss der röm. Religion auf den Character des Volks und des Staats (prefixed to his translation of Ferguson's Hist. of the Roman Republic. Bd. 3. S. v. ff.)

The religion of the Romans was of a graver and more moral cast. We find the ancient Romans distinguished not only for their politi-

---

[1] Comp. with particular reference to the old Greek poets, *P. van Limburg Brouwer* disp. qua respondetur ad quæstionem, an et quatenus Philosophi, qui ante Socratem et Platonem fuerunt, atque illi ipsi, et qui ex eorum scholis postea prodierunt, in commemorandis vel et exponendis principiis moralibus Naturæ et Providentiæ Deorum notionem subinde adhibuerint, et virtutis constanter ac sincero pectore colendæ incitamenta, præsidia, atque alimenta inde deduxerint? Lugd. Batav. 1824. 4to. p. 8 seq.

[2] Plato (de repùbl. II.) proposes to banish the existing mythology from his republic on account of its corrupting influence. Aristotle (Politic. VII. 8.) directs that the young at least shall be kept from such rites as are of an immoral tendency.

[3] As is supposed by *Warburton* (Divine Legation of Moses. Lond. 1742.), and after him by many others. On the other side *Ste. Croix* recherches sur les mystères du paganisme. Par. 1784. — *P. E. Muller* de disciplina arcana Eleusiniorum, affixed to his work, de hierarchia et studio vitæ asceticæ in sacris et mysteriis Græcorum Romanorumque latentibus. Havn. 1803. 8vo. — [J. Leland's Adv. and Necess. of the Christ. Revelation. Vol. I. cc. 8, 9. p. 151-190. — Tr.] On the difference between the earlier and later Mysteries, vid. *Lobeck* de morte Bacchi (diatr. II. Viteberg. 1810 et 1812. 4to.) diatr. I. p. 21. II. p. 15 seq.

cal but their domestic virtues, as well as for a chastity very rarely met with amongst Heathen nations. As long as they remained strangers to the Arts of Greece, they escaped the poisonous influence of its mythology;[1] but from the conquest of Carthage and Corinth their national character underwent a great change. The riches which flowed into the city from all quarters, the luxuries introduced from Asia, and the instruction of the youth by Greek masters, led rapidly to licentiousness and vice. The mythology of the Greeks adhered inseparably to their Arts, and, when once spread through the nation by the poets, it soon softened the severity of Roman virtue.[2]

§ 12.

RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE OF THE ROMANS.

It was a universally received notion of the ancients, that the Gods had themselves everywhere appointed the particular form in which they were to be worshipped, and hence they were mutually tolerant as long as each nation kept its religion at home. Such was also the case amongst the Romans. On the other hand, to introduce strange Gods without the sanction of the state was considered treasonable.[1] When therefore, with the extension of the Roman conquests, new modes of worship were constantly finding their way into the city, weakening the attachment of the citizens to their national religion, and often directly encouraging licentiousness, the laws against *sacra peregrina* were rigorously enforced.[2] But though these laws were effectual enough against all public associations for the practice of foreign superstitions (especially as they came also under the cogni-

---

1 *Polyb.* hist. VI. c. 54. *Dionys. Halicarn.* Antiquitt. Roman. II. c. 67, 69.

2 Comp. *Terentii* Eunuch. Act. III. Scen. 5. v. 35. *Ovid.* Tristium II. v. 287 seq. *Martialis* Lib. XI. Epigr. 44. *Senera de brevit. vitæ*, c. 16: Quid aliud est vitia nostra incendere, quam auctores illis inscribere deos, et dare morbo, exemplo divinitatis, excusatam licentiam? cf. *de vita beata*, c. 26. — C. Meiners Geschich. des Verfalls der Sitten u. der Staatsverfassung der Römer. Leipz. 1782 8vo.

1 *Cicero de legg.* II. c. 8: Separatim nemo habessit deos: neve novos, sed ne advenas, nisi publice adscitos, privatim colunto.

2 Vid. particularly the extirpation of the rites in honor of Bacchus, B. C. 185. *Livius* XXXIX. c. 8 seq. and the Senatus-consultum de tollendis Bacchanalibus in the treatise, to be cited presently, by *Bynkershoeck.* — *Valerius Maximus* I. 3, de peregrina religione rejecta. — cf. *Corn. van Bynkershoeck* de cultu religionis peregrinæ apud veteres Romanos (in ejusd. Opp omn. ed. *Ph. Vicat.* Colon. Allobr. 1761. fol. T. I. p. 343 seq.) *Chr. G. F. Walch* de Romanorum in tolerandis diversis religionibus disciplina publica (in Novis Commentariis Soc. Reg. Scient. Göttingensis Tom. III. 1773). *De Burigny* mémoire sur le respect, que les Romains avoient pour la religion, dans laquelle on examine, jusqu'à quel dégré de licence la tolérance étoit portée à Rome (Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscript. T. 34. hist. p. 48 seq.)

zance of the laws[3] concerning *collegia*[4]), it was not so easy a matter to prevent it in private.

§ 13.

INFLUENCE OF PHILOSOPHY ON THE POPULAR RELIGION.

As soon as the schools of philosophy were established in Greece, the Divine Unity was distinctly acknowledged,[1] and Morality established on a more worthy basis.[2] But whilst in some of these schools philosophy proved the source of a deep religious feeling to the initiated, it could not fail to produce much skepticism amongst the far more numerous class of the half-instructed. Although Plato and Aristotle, for instance, spoke with great forbearance of the popular religion, and even conformed themselves externally to its requisitions,

---

[3] See, besides the prohibitions in the time of the republic, that of *Julius Cæsar* (*Sueton.* Cæsar. c. 42.), *Augustus* (*Sueton.* Octavian. c. 32.), etc. Comp. the later Jurists in the Pandects *Gajus* (about A. D. 160) *lib. III.* (*Digest. Lib. III. Tit.* 4. *l.* 1): Neque societas, neque collegium, neque hujusmodi corpus passim omnibus habere conceditur: nam et legibus et senatusconsultis, et Principalibus constitutionibus ea res coërcetur etc. Esp. *Dig. Lib. XLVII. Tit.* 22. *de collegiis et corporibus illicitis. Lex* 1. (*Marcianus* about 222): Mandatis Principalibus præcipitur Præsidibus Provinciarum, ne patiantur esse collegia sodalitia. — § 1. Sed religionis causa coire non prohibentur: dum tamen per hoc non fiat contra Senatusconsultum, quo illicita collegia arcentur. *Lex* 2 (*Ulpianus* + 228): Quisquis illicitum collegium usurpaverit, ea pœna tenetur, qua tenentur, qui hominibus armatis loca publica vel templa occupasse judicati sunt (that is, according to *Dig. XLVIII. Tit.* 4. *l.* 1, like those convicted of high treason). *Lex* 3, (*Marcianus*) § 1: In summa autem, nisi ex Senatusconsulti auctoritate, vel Cæsaris, collegium, vel quodcunque tale corpus coïerit, contra Senatusconsultum, et Mandata, et Constitutiones collegium celebrat. cf. *Iac. Cujacii* Observationum Lib. VII. Observ. 30. *Barn. Brissonii* Antiquitatum ex jure civili selectarum Lib. I. c. 14.

[4] Collegia, Sodalitia, Sodalitates, ἑταιρείαι. Such societies were very frequent amongst both Greeks and Romans. The bond of union being either relationship (comp. the Roman curiæ, and the Athenian φρατρίαι) or community of profession (as in Rome the collegia tibicinum, aurificum, architectorum, etc.) They had peculiar rites and a common fund, as well as secret meetings and feasts (ἔρανοι.) Thus not only did the priests of the same Deity form such collegia (e. g. Sodales Augustales, Aureliani, etc.) but any union for the worship of certain deities was classed under that name. So Cato says (*Cicero de Senectute*, c. 13.): Sodalitates me quæstore constitutæ sunt sacris Idæis Magnæ Matris acceptis. Thus *Philo in Flaccum* says of the ἑταιρείαις καὶ συνόδοις in Alexandria, αἳ ἀεὶ προφάσει θυσιῶν εἰστιῶντο τοῖς πράγμασιν ἐμπαροινοῦσαι. cf. *Salmasii* observatt. ad jus Rom. et Atticum c. 3, 4. *J. G. Stuckii* Antiquitatum convivialium lib. I. c. 31. (*Opp.* Tom. I. Lugd. Bat. et Amstel. 1695. fol. p. 173 seq.)

[1] cf. *Cicero de nat. Deorum*, l. 1. 10 seq. *Rad. Cudworthi* Systema intellectuale, vertit et illustr. *J. L. Moshemius* (Jenæ. 1733. fol.) p. 730 seq. (*Ralph Cudworth's* Intellectual System of the Universe. fol. 1678.) *C. Meiners* hist. doctrinæ de vero Deo. Lemgov. 1780. P. II.

[2] Stäudlin's Gesch. d. Moralphilosophie (Hannover, 1822), in many places. *Limburg Brouwer*, as cited § 10, note 1.

yet it was plain that many of the prevailing notions were utterly irreconcilable with the principles of their philosophy. The *Stoics* attempted to defend the popular mythology by teaching that the Gods represented the primary principles of the universe, and interpreting their fabulous history allegorically. But the arrogant spirit of this sect was entirely incompatible with any thing like religious feeling.[3] The *Epicurean* philosophy, denying all divine influence whatever, and ascribing the origin of the world to accident, whatever might have been the intention of its founder, did yet in effect prove fatal to all morality. Little better was the influence of the *Middle* and *New Academy*.

No sooner had the literature of Greece been introduced at Rome by Livius Andronicus (about 240 years before Christ), than we find here also traces of skeptical opinions.[4] And from the time of the famous Athenian embassy (Carneades, Diogenes, Critolaus, 155 B. C.) the progress of philosophy tended not only to weaken the faith in the popular religion,[5] but with many to destroy all religious faith what-

---

[3] *Seneca* epist. 73: Jupiter quo antecedit virum bonum? diutius bonus est. Sapiens nihilo se minoris æstimat, quod virtutes ejus spatio breviori clauduntur. — Sapiens tam æquo animo omnia apud alios videt contemnitque quam Jupiter: et hoc se magis suspicit, quod Jupiter uti illis non potest, sapiens non vult. Schwabe über das Verhältniss der stoischen Moral zum Christenthum, in d. Zeitschrift für Moral von C. F. Böhme und G. Ch. Müller, Bd. 1. St. 3. S. 38 ff. *G. H. Klippell* comm. exhibens doctrinæ Stoicorum ethicæ atque christianæ expositionem et comparationem. Götting. 1823. 8vo.

[4] cf. *Ennius* in *Cic. de Divin.* II. c. 50:

> Ego Deum genus esse semper dixi, et dicam cælitum:
> Sed eos non curare opinor, quid agat humanum genus.

[5] *Cic. de invent.* I, 29: In eo autem, quod in opinione positum est, hujusmodi sunt probabilia: — *eos, qui philosophiæ dent operam, non arbitrari Deos esse. Idem pro Cluentio*, c. 61. *De nat. Deor.* II. c. 2. *Tuscul. Quæst.* I. c. 5, 6. *Juvenal.* Satyr. 11. v. 149:

> Esse aliquos manes, et subterranea regna,
> Et contum, et stygio ranas in gurgite nigras,
> Atque una transire vadum tot millia cymba,
> Nec pueri credunt, nisi qui nondum ære lavantur.

Thus Varro (B. C. 50), in *Augustinus de Civitate Dei* VI. c. 5, distinguishes tria genera theologiæ, viz. mythicon, quo maxime utuntur poëtæ; physicon, quo philosophi; civile, quo populi. Primum, quod dixi, in eo sunt multa contra dignitatem et naturam immortalium ficta. — Secundum genus est, quod demonstravi, de quo multos libros philosophi reliquerunt. In quibus est: dii qui sint, ubi, quod genus etc. (Augustine adds: Nihil in hoc genere culpavit. — Removit tamen hoc genus a foro i. e. a populis: scholis vero et parietibus clausit. Illud autem primum mendacissimum atque turpissimum a civitatibus non removit.) Tertium genus est, quod in urbibus cives, maxime sacerdotes, nosse atque administrare debent. In quo est, quos deos publice colere, quæ sacra et sacrificia facere quemquam par sit. Prima theologia maxime accommodata est ad theatrum, secunda ad mundum, tertia ad urbem. *Scævola* (see note 8, below), and *Plutarchus* Amator. c. 18, and de placitis philosoph. 1. c. 6, (τὸ μυθικὸν, τὸ φυσικὸν, τὸ πολιτικὸν,) make the same distinction.

ever.[6] But whilst unbelief was thus becoming more and more general, even the most skeptical agreed that the popular religion must by all means be upheld.[7] It had become so inwoven with the whole constitution of the state, with all concerns both public and private, that it was impossible to say what might be the consequences of a change. To the multitude no philosophy could ever supply motives to virtue equally strong;[8] and to introduce foreign religions would have been to weaken the feeling of nationality, and dispose them to foreign manners.[9]

---

6 In *Sallustius*, Catilina, c. 51, Cæsar says, In luctu atque miseriis mortem ærumnarum requiem, non cruciatum esse: eam cuncta mortalium mala dissolvere: ultra neque curæ neque gaudio locum esse. In reference to which Cato says, c. 52: Bene et composite C. Cæsar paulo ante in hoc ordine de vita et morte disseruit; falsa, credo, existimans, quæ de inferis memorantur: diverso itinere malos a bonis loca tetra, inculta, fœda atque formidolosa habere.

7 *Augustinus de civ. Dei* VI. c. 2. says of Varro and his work *Rerum divinarum libb. XVI:* Cum vero deos eosdem ita coluerit, colendosque censuerit, ut in eo ipso opere literarum suarum dicat, se timere, ne pereant, non incursu hostili, sed civium negligentia: de qua illos velut ruina liberari a se dicit, et in memoria bonorum per hujusmodi libros recondi atque servari, utiliore cura, quam qua Metellus de incendio sacra Vestalia, et Æneas de Trojano excidio Penates liberasse prædicatur. *Ibid.* IV. c. 31: Ipse Varro, — cum ad deos colendos multis locis velut religiosus hortetur, nonne ita confitetur: non se illa judicio suo sequi, quæ civitatem Romanam instituisse commemorat; ut, si eam civitatem novam constitueret, ex naturæ potius formula deos nominaque deorum se fuisse dedicaturum non dubitet confiteri? Sed jam quoniam in vetere populo essent accepta, ab antiquis nominum et cognominum historiam tenere ut tradita est debere se dicit, et ad eum finem illam scribere ac perscrutari, ut potius eos magis colere, quam despicere vulgus velit.

8 *Cicero de legg.* II. c. 7. (see § 9, note 4.) *Augustin. de civit. Dei* IV. 27: Relatum est in literis, doctissimum pontificem *Scævolam* (an older cotemporary of Cicero) disputasse tria genera tradita deorum; unum a poëtis, alterum a philosophis, tertium a principibus civitatis. Primum genus nugatorium dicit esse, quod multa de diis fingantur indigna: secundum non congruere civitatibus, quod habeat aliqua supervacua, aliqua etiam quæ obsit populis nosse (viz. non esse deos Herculem, Æsculapium etc. — eorum, qui sint dii, non habere civitates vera simulacra — verum Deum nec sexum habere, nec ætatem, nec definita corporis membra). Hæc pontifex nosse populos non vult, nam falsa esse non putat. *Expedire igitur existimat falli in religione civitates: quod dicere etiam in libris Rerum divinarum ipse Varro non dubitat.* — *Strabo* in geograph 1. c. 2. pag. 19: Οὐ γὰρ ὄχλον τε γυναικῶν, καὶ παντὸς χυδαίου πλήθους ἐπαγαγεῖν λόγῳ δυνατὸν φιλοσόφῳ, καὶ προσκαλέσασθαι πρὸς εὐσέβειαν, καὶ ὁσιότητα καὶ πίστιν, ἀλλὰ δεῖ καὶ διὰ δεισιδαιμονίας· τοῦτο δ' οὐκ ἄνευ μυθοποιΐας, καὶ τερατείας.

9 Comp. the advice of Mæcenas to Augustus in Dio Cassius lib. LII: τὸ μὲν θεῖον πάντη πάντως αὐτός τε σέβου κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τιμᾶν ἀνάγκαζε· τοὺς δὲ δὴ ξενίζοντάς τι περὶ αὐτὸ καὶ μίσει καὶ κόλαζε, μὴ μόνων τῶν θεῶν ἕνεκα, ὧν καταφρονήσας οὐδ' ἄλλου ἄν τινος προστιμήσειεν, ἀλλ' ὅτι καινά τινα δαιμόνια οἱ τοιοῦτοι ἀντεισφέροντες, πολλοὺς ἀναπείθουσιν ἀλλοτριονομεῖν· κἀκ τούτου καὶ συνωμοσίαι καὶ συστάσεις ἑταιρείαι τε γίγνονται, ἅπερ ἥκιστα μοναρχίᾳ συμφέρει· μήτ' οὖν ἀθέῳ τινὶ, μήτε γόητι συγχωρήσῃς εἶναι.

§ 14.

CHANGE IN THE STATE OF RELIGIOUS FEELING UNDER THE EMPERORS.

Vid. *P. E. Müller* de hierarchia et studio vitæ asceticæ in sacris et mysteriis Græcorum Romanorumque latentibus. Hafn. 1803. — C. Meiners Gesch. des Verfalls der Sitten, der Wissenschaften, u. Sprache der Römer in den ersten Jahrhunderten nach Christi Geburt. 1791. 8vo.

From the time of Augustus, however, we find the grossest superstition gradually insinuating itself into both the practice of the people and the systems of the philosophers.[1] With their freedom, the Romans lost also their national spirit, and their attachment to the national customs and religion; whilst their reverence for the Gods must needs be somewhat weakened by seeing amongst them mortals of the most despicable character.[2] The unexampled luxury and effeminacy of the time led naturally to indolence, weakness, and cowardice,[3] and a continual craving after excitement. The enervated

---

1 *Plinii* hist. nat. II. c. 5: Irridendum vero, agere curam rerum humanarum illud quicquid est summum. Anne tam tristi atque multiplici ministerio non pollui credamus dubitemusve? Vix prope est judicare, utrum magis conducat generi humano, quando aliis nullus est deorum respectus, aliis pudendus. Externis famulantur sacris, ac digitis deos gestant: monstra quoque, quæ colunt, damnant; et excogitant cibos: imperia dira in ipsos, ne somno quidem quieto, irrogant. Non matrimonia, non liberos, non denique quidquam aliud, nisi juvantibus sacris, deligunt. Alii in Capitolio fallunt, ac fulminantem pejerant Jovem: et hos juvant scelera, illos sacra sua pœnis agunt. — *Ibid.* VII. c 56: Post sepulturam variæ Manium ambages. Omnibus a supremo die eadem, quæ ante primum: nec magis a morte sensus ullus aut corpori aut animæ, quam ante natalem. Eadem enim vanitas in futurum etiam se propagat, et in mortis quoque tempora ipsa sibi vitam mentitur: alias immortalitatem animæ, alias transfigurationem, alias sensum inferis dando, et Manes colendo, Deumque faciendo, qui jam etiam homo esse desierit etc. This very Pliny shows, however, in his own example, that unbelief and superstition may be found in the same person. Thus in *Lib.* II. he evidently believes in omens, e. g. *cap.* 86: Nunquam urbs Roma tremuit, ut non futuri eventus alicujus id prænuntium esset. How hopeless the lot of man appeared to him may be seen from *Lib.* VII. c. 1: Hominis causa videtur cuncta alia genuisse Natura, magna sæva mercede contra tanta sua munera: non sit ut satis æstimare, parens melior homini, an tristior noverca fuerit. — cf. *Taciti* annall. VI. c. 22.

2 According to Polybius, 5. the custom of honoring benefactors with altars and sacrifices originated with the Asiatics, the Greeks, and Syrians. Such honors also were frequently paid to the Proconsuls in their provinces (Cic. ad Atticum V. 21. Sueton. Aug. c. 52. *Mongault* in the Mémoires de l'Academie des Inscr. T. I. p. 353 seq) — Cæsar was the first who caused these honors to be decreed to him at Rome also by the Senate (Suet. Cæs. 76.). Domitian began his decrees: Dominus et Deus noster hoc fieri jubet (Sueton. Domit. 13.). — *I. D. Schoepflini* comm. de apotheosi s. consecratione Impp. Romanorum (in his Commentatt. hist. et crit. Basil. 1741. 4to. p. 1. seq.)

3 Juven. Sat. VI. 292 – 300:

> Nunc patimur longæ pacis mala. Sævior armis
> Luxuria incubuit, victumque ulciscitur orbem.

and cowardly are always prone to superstition, especially with such dangers around them as now menaced every citizen of Rome; whilst the love of excitement led them to enter eagerly into any thing that savoured of mystery. To all this must be added the prevailing neglect of the sciences (Law and Juridical Eloquence being almost the only studies), and, more important still, the appalling immorality of the age.[4] Men sought refuge from their fears in the practice of magic rites, and hoped to avoid the punishment of their sins by multiplying their purifications.[5] The religions of the East, with their mysterious ceremonies and the ascetic life of their priests, had always possessed strong attractions for the superstitious Romans, so that it had been necessary to enact laws to oppose them. But now these laws proved a weak barrier to the urgent impulse of the time; whilst the prospect of gain filled the empire with a swarm of soothsayers, dream-interpreters, magicians, and priests of foreign religions, whose direct interest of course it was to encourage as much as possible the prevailing superstition of the time.[6] The efforts of the emperors to

---

Nullum crimen abest, facinusque libidinis, ex quo
Paupertas Romana perît: hinc fluxit ad istos
Et Sybaris colles, hinc et Rhodos et Miletos,
Atque coronatum et petulans madidumque Tarentum.
Prima peregrinos obscœna pecunia mores
Intulit, et turpi fregerunt secula luxu
Divitiæ molles.

4 Comp. especially the Satires of Persius and Juvenal. *Seneca* de ira, II. 8: Omnia sceleribus ac vitiis plena sunt: plus committitur, quam quod possit coërcitione sanari. Certatur ingenti quodam nequitiæ certamine: major quotidie peccandi cupiditas, minor verecundia est. Expulso melioris æquiorisque respectu, quocunque visum est, libido se impingit. Nec furtiva jam scelera sunt: præter oculos eunt: adeoque in publicum missa nequitia est, et in omnium pectoribus evaluit, ut innocentia non rara, sed nulla sit. Numquid enim singuli aut pauci rupere legem? undique, velut signo dato, ad fas nefasque miscendum coorti sunt.

— — Non hospes ab hospite tutus
Non socer a genero. Fratrum quoque gratia rara est.
Imminet exitio vir conjugis, illa mariti.
Lurida terribiles miscent aconita novercæ.
Filius ante diem patrios inquirit in annos.
(Ovid. Met. I. v. 144 seq.)

Et quota pars ista scelerum est! etc. cf. *ejusd. epist.* 95. *Pauli epist. ad Rom.* 1, 21 seq. Comp. *Cornel. Adami* de malis Romanorum ante prædicationem Evangelii moribus (in his Exercitationes exegeticæ. Groening. 1712. 4to. exercit. 5.)

5 *Diodorus Sic.* bibl. hist. XX. c. 43. p. 755: Δεισιδαίμονες γὰρ οἱ μέλλοντες ἐγχειρεῖν ταῖς παρανόμοις καὶ μεγάλαις πράξεσι.

6 In spite of decrees of the senate, and the interference of the consuls, a temple had been erected to the worship of Serapis and Isis as early as B. C. 43. Besides the priests of this religion, there were the Galli, the priests of Dea Syra, the Magi, the Chaldeans, the Astrologers (genus hominum potentibus infidum, sperantibus fallax, quod in civitate nostra et vetabitur semper, et retinebitur. *Tacit.* hist. I. 22.), and the Jews. Comp. D. Tiedmann disputat. de quæstione, quæ fuerit artium magicarum origo etc. Marburg. 1787. 4to. p. 56 seq. — How much the females in particular were given to such superstitions is strikingly pourtrayed in Juvenal. Sat. VI. 510 – 555. cf. Strabo, VII. c. 3. § 4.

suppress these foreign superstitions were of the less avail, that they themselves believed in the efficacy of magic rites, practised them in secret, and only forbade them lest they should be made use of to the prejudice of their own persons.

The progress of superstition was not a little furthered by the influence of the philosophers.* Formerly they had attacked not only the popular religion, but all religions whatever; now they were seen borrowing from the popular religion materials to build up systems under which all kinds of superstition found shelter. Under Augustus the long forgotten doctrines of Pythagoras were revived in a most visionary form by *Anaxilaus*, who was soon followed by the still more visionary *Apollonius of Tyana*.[7] They traced these doctrines to the mysteries of the Egyptian priests, and from this source undertook to revive them. At the same time they derived the Platonic philosophy from the Pythagorean, and thus a strange, heterogeneous structure grew up under their hands, in which not only all popular religions, but also all magic rites found their justification. From this time the Platonists also forsook the skepticism of the New Academy, and joined these Modern Pythagoreans, seeking at the same time to assimilate their system to other systems of philosophy, especially to that of Aristotle. As the mode of life of the Pythagoreans was far from inviting, this *New Platonism* became the reigning philosophy of the day.[8] Of the skeptical systems, on the other hand, the *Epicurean* alone had now any considerable influence.[9] Of the pure *Peripatetics* there were always but few; and though the *Stoics* could boast many distinguished men (Seneca, Dio of Prusa, Epictetus), their system of morals was more admired than adopted.[10] The shamelessness of

---

* See Tzschirner Fall des Heidenthums. Bd. 1. S. 127 ff.

7 Apollonius lived A. U. 750–849 (B. C. 3 — A. D. 96). His life has been written by Philostratus the elder (Philostratorum opera gr. et lat. ed. G. Olearius. Lips. 1709. fol.), claiming to be a work of Damis, a companion of Apollonius, till then undiscovered, with some additions from a work of Maximus of Æge (1, 3). But the imposture is betrayed, not only by the absurd wonders therein related, but by the palpable anachronisms. Vid. Hug Einleitung in das N. Testament. 2d ed. p. 14. (Introd. to the N. T., translated from the German by the Rev. D. D. Wait. Lond. 1827. 2 vols. 8vo.)

8 These Platonicians adopted all the popular superstitions, and, amongst others, the practice of Astrology. Thrasillus, the Astrologer of Tiberius, was one of their number (Sueton. in Tib. c. 14. 62. Tac. ann. VI. 20).

9 Comp. note 1. Juvenal, Satyr. XIII. 86 seq.

> Sunt, in fortunæ qui casibus omnia ponant,
> Et nullo credant mundum rectore moveri,
> Natura volvente vices et lucis et anni;
> Atque ideo intrepidi quæcunque altaria tangunt.

10 *Cicero Orat. pro Murena*, c. 30: Arripuit — disputandi causa — magna pars. As to the morals of the philosophers of this time, comp. Seneca. ep. 29, where he gives the grounds of his despair of converting a certain wit, Marcellinus, to philosophy: Scrutabitur scholas nostras, et objiciet philosophis congiaria, amicas, gulam: ostendet mihi alium in adulterio, alium in popina, alium in aula. — Hos mihi circulatores, qui philosophiam honestius neglexissent, quam vendunt, in faciem ingeret. *Juvenal. Sat. II.* init.

the *Cynics* prevented their exercising any considerable influence on the age.

II.

CONDITION OF THE JEWS.

SOURCES. — Scriptures of the New Testament. — *Flavii Josephi* Opera.

J. M. Jost, Geschichte der Israeliten seit der Zeit der Maccabäer bis auf unsere Tage. Berlin. 1820. [Lardner's Cred. P. I. Vol. I. ch. 2–6. Prideaux's Conn. P. I. Book 4–8. Milman's Hist. of the Jews. Vol. I.—Tr.]

§ 15.

IN PALESTINE.

After the Babylonish exile the Jews were subject to the Persians, the Egyptians, and the Syrians successively, and were then an independent nation under the Maccabees, until Hyrcanus, the last of the name, was forced to submit to the Romans (167–63 B. C.). On the death of Hyrcanus the whole land was held under the Romans by Herod the Idumæan (B. C. 40–4), who at his death divided it amongst his three sons, giving to *Archelaus* Judea, Idumæa, and Samaria, with the title of Ethnarch; to *Philip* Batanæa, Ituræa, and Trachonitis; and to *Herod Antipas* Galilee and Peræa, with the title of Tetrarchs. After the banishment of Archelaus (A. D. 6) his Ethnarchy became a Roman province under Pontius Pilate (A. D. 28–37); and on the death of Philip (A. D. 34) his Tetrarchy was bestowed on Herod Agrippa (A. D. 37), who was soon after invested with the Tetrarchy of the banished Herod Antipas (A. D. 39), and in the end made king of all Palestine by the emperor Claudius (A. D. 41). On his death, however, his kingdom became once more a Roman province, under the successive procurators Cuspius Fadus, Tiberius Alexander, Ventidius Cumanus, Claudius Felix, Portius Festus, Albinus, and Gessius Florus. Some years afterwards his son Agrippa II. was made king of Chalcis (A. D. 47), but soon had to exchange his kingdom for the Tetrarchy of Philip (A. D. 52), together with which was intrusted to him the superintendence of the temple at Jerusalem. He died at Jerusalem (A. D. 100), and with him ended the race of the Herods.[1]

The weight of foreign fetters, and especially the religious persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes, had inflamed to the utmost the hatred and contempt of the Jews for foreign religions and manners;

---

[1] *Christ. Noldii* hist. Idumæa. s. de vita et gestis Herodum. Franeq. 1660. 12mo., reprinted in Havercamp's ed. of Josephus, T. II. Appendix, p. 331 seq.

whilst it in like degree excited their national feeling, and strengthened their attachment to the religion of their fathers. But alas! the spirit of that religion had expired with the Prophets, and the priesthood found no longer any difficulty in directing the revived zeal of the nation to the observance of the ceremonial law, and especially of the constantly enlarged Levitical 'cultus' (code), in which the whole interest of the priests was bound up. Even the *Synagogues*,[2] though in themselves well fitted to promote a more spiritual religion, were made to subserve the purposes of the Levitical priesthood. The result of all this was a most obstinate attachment to the ceremonial law, and even a fanatical zeal in its behalf, without any true religious feeling, or moral improvement; but rather accompanied by a more and more universal and deeper corruption.[3] Whilst religion was thus made to consist in outward observances, the blind belief in their national superiority was daily strengthened, and with it the hope that Jehovah would soon release his chosen people from the yoke of the Heathen, and make them the rulers of the world under the Messiah; and the earthly and sensual notions entertained of the pleasures of the Messiah's kingdom were necessarily in the highest degree destructive of all inward and true religion.[4] The notion was very common, also, that it was unworthy of the people of God to submit to a foreign yoke.[5] On the other hand, the blind prejudice and pride of a nation so despised excited the spleen of the Procurators, which was often vented in slight provocations and acts of oppression. Such a state of things led to repeated rebellions against the Roman power, till at last the general insurrection in the Procuratorship of Gessius Florus (A. D. 66) brought with it the devastation of the whole land, and the destruction of Jerusalem (A. D. 70). This broke down the strength of the Jews for a time, but did not change their disposition or their aims.

We have yet to notice the three sects into which the Jews were

---

2 Cf. *Camp. Vitringa* de Synagoga vetere lib. III. Franeker. 1696. 4to. ed. 2. Leucopetr. 1726.

3 Comp. Josephus passim; e. g. de B J. V, 10, 5, he declares, *μήτε πόλιν ἄλλην τοιαῦτα πεπονθέναι, μήτε γενεὰν ἐξ αἰῶνος γεγονέναι κακίας γονιμωτέραν. Ibid.* V, 13, 6 *Ibid.* VII, 8, 1: *ἐγένετο γάρ πως ὁ χρόνος ἐκεῖνος παντοδαπῆς ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις πονηρίας πολυφόρος, ὡς μηδὲν κακίας ἔργον ἄπρακτον καταλιπεῖν, μηδ' εἴ τις ἐπινοίᾳ διαπλάττειν ἐθελήσειεν ἔχειν ἄν τι καινότερον ἐξευρεῖν. οὕτως ἰδίᾳ τε καὶ κοινῇ πάντες ἐνόσησαν, καὶ πρὸς ὑπερβαλεῖν ἀλλήλους ἔντε ταῖς πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀσεβείαις, καὶ ταῖς εἰς τοὺς πλησίον ἀδικίαις ἐφιλονείκησαν.*

4 On Judaism generally, see De Wette's biblische Dogmatik (2te Aufl. Berlin. 1818.) § 76–82. — *C. H. L. Poelitz* dissert. de gravissimis theologiæ seriorum Judæorum decretis. Lips. 1794. 4to. The same, pragmatische Uebersicht der Theologie der spätern Juden. Leipz. 1795. Th. 1. 8vo. — On the notions concerning the Messiah, see *Bertholdt* Christologia Judæorum Jesu Apostolorumque ætate. Erlang. 1811. 8vo. (to be used with caution). — *C. A. Th. Keil* historia dogmatis de regno Messiæ Christi et Apostolorum ætate. Lips. 1781 (in Keilii opusculis, ed. *I. D. Goldhorn.* Lips. 1821 Sect. I. p. 22 seq.)

5 Judas Galilæus and his followers: *μόνον ἡγεμόνα καὶ δεσπότην τὸν θεὸν ὑπειληφότες* (Jos. Ant. XVIII, 1, 6.) — *Ἰούδας εἰς ἀπόστασιν ἐνῆγε τοὺς ἐπιχωρίους, κακίζων, εἰ φόρον τε Ῥωμαίοις τελεῖν ὑπομένουσι, καὶ μετὰ τὸν θεὸν οὕσουσι θνητοὺς δεσπότας* (de B. J. II, 8, 1.) Comp. Deut. xvii. 15.

divided. There were first the *Pharisees*, in whom we have the true representation of Judaism, with all the new ideas acquired in exile, and its enlarged Levitical law. This sect reflected most fully the national character, and of consequence was the favorite sect of the people. Then the *Sadducees*, who, on the other hand, upheld the ancient Hebraism as taught in the books of Moses. And lastly the *Essenes*, who lived an ascetic and retired life on the west side of the Dead Sea, and had but little influence on the people at large.[6]

§ 16.

SENTIMENTS OF THE HEATHEN NATIONS TOWARDS THE JEWS.

By the Heathen, Judaism was regarded with the reverence they considered due to all ancient national religions; nor did the various rulers of the land neglect to pay the usual honors to Jehovah as the national God.[1] The Jews, however, on their part, were by no means willing to show the same respect to the religions of other nations, but treated their Gods with contempt, avoided all intercourse with foreigners as unclean, and expected from their own Jehovah, that he would at some future time make them triumphant over the whole world.[2] All this drew upon them the greater hatred and contempt, that the ancient nations were wont to estimate the dignity of the Gods by the prosperity and strength of the nations over which they presided.[3]

---

[6] Trium scriptorum illustrium *(Drusii, Jos. Scaligeri*, et *Serarii)* de tribus Judæorum sectis syntagma, ed. *Iac Triglandius.* Delphis. 1703. 2 voll. 4to. De Wette Heb.-Jüd. Archäologie. 1814. § 274, 275. [See Prid. Conn. P. II. Book V. Jortin's Remarks on Eccl. History, vol. II. p. 103. Neander's Hist. of the Christian Church (translation), vol. I. p. 52. Calmet's Dict. of the Bible, Art. *Therapeutæ.* — Tr.]

[1] Alexander is said to have offered sacrifice in the temple at Jerusalem under the direction of the High Priest (Joseph. Ant. XI, 8, 5.) Also Ptolemy Euergetes (comp. Apion. II. 5.). Seleucus Philopator defrayed the expense of the sacrifices from his own income (2 Macc. iii. 1 – 3). Augustus did the same, according to Philo, de legat. ad Caium, p. 1036. Vitellius sacrificed in Jerusalem (Jos. Ant. XVIII, 5, 3). Tertull. Apol. c. 26: Cujus (Judææ) et deum victimis, et templum donis, et gentem fœderibus aliquando, O Romani, honorastis.

[2] The Jewish expectation of a Messiah was no doubt known to the Heathen, but we must not judge of the degree of their knowledge by the passages: *Sueton.* Vespas. c. 4, Percrebuerat Oriente toto vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis, ut eo tempore Judæa profecti rerum potirentur. *Tacit.* hist. 5, 13, Pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis sacerdotum literis contineri, eo ipso tempore fore, ut valesceret Oriens, profectique Judæa rerum potirentur. For both these historians have evidently copied Josephus (de Bello Judaico, VI. 5, 4: ἦν χρησμὸς ἀμφίδολος ὁμοίως ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς εὑρημένος γράμμασιν, ὡς κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας τὶς αὐτῶν ἄρξει τῆς οἰκουμένης), as is proved by their using the same language, as well as by the common allusion to Vespasian. The object of Josephus in this passage was to make his nation of importance, and for the present at least to shield them from suspicion. Tacitus often makes use of Josephus in the history of the Jews, though always as a Roman.

[3] *Cicero pro Flacco*, c. 28: Sua cuique civitati religio, Læli, est, nostra nobis.

They were most hated however by their neighbours, particularly the Egyptians; by the Romans they were rather despised.[4] Hence under these last we find no attempt to exterminate their religion, like that of Antiochus Epiphanes; though there was occasionally a manifest determination to insist on the observance of certain Roman customs in defiance of the national prejudices.

This universal hatred and contempt of the Jews led to the strangest fables concerning their origin and history,[5] and the most fantastic notions concerning their religion;[6] and these in their turn operated to increase the contempt and hatred which had given birth to them.

Stantibus Hierosolymis, pacatisque Judæis, tamen istorum religio sacrorum a splendore hujus imperii, gravitate nominis nostri, majorum institutis abhorrebat: nunc vero hoc magis quod illa gens, quid de imperio nostro sentiret, ostendit armis: quam cara diis immortalibus esset, docuit, quod est victa, quod elocata, quod servata. — *Apion* ap. Joseph. contra Apionem II, 11. *Minucii Felicis* Octavius, c. 10., the Heathen Cecilius says: Judæorum sola et misera gentilitas unum — Deum — — coluerunt; cujus adeo nulla vis nec potestas est, ut sit Romanis numinibus cum sua sibi natione captivus.

4 Of *Apollonius Molon*, a rhetorician of Rhodes, B. C. 70., Josephus says, c. Apion. II, 14: ποτὲ μὲν ὡς ἀθέους καὶ μισανθρώπους λοιδορεῖ, ποτὲ δ' αὖ δειλίαν ἡμῖν ὀνειδίζει· καὶ τοὔμπαλιν ἔστιν ὅπου τόλμαν κατηγορεῖ καὶ ἀπονοίαν· λέγει δὲ καὶ ἀφυεστάτους εἶναι τῶν βαρβάρων. — *Tacit.* hist. V. 5: Apud ipsos fides obstinata, misericordia in promptu, sed *adversus omnes alios hostile odium.* c. 8. despectissima pars servientium — teterrima gens. *Diodor. Sic.* XXXIV. p. 524. *Philostratus* in vita Apollonii, V. c. 33. Juven. Sat. XIV, 103. — According to *Philo* in Flacc. p. 969, there was amongst the Egyptians παλαιὰ καὶ τρόπον τινὰ γιγεννημένη πρὸς Ἰουδαίους ἀπέχθεια. Jos. c. Apion. I, 25. τῶν δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς βλασφημιῶν ἤρξαντο Αἰγύπτιοι — — — αἰτίας δὲ πολλὰς ἔλαθον τοῦ μισεῖν καὶ φθονεῖν etc.

5 The first traces of these fables are found in the fragment of *Hecataeus Milesius* (Abderita?), in Photius bibl. cod. 154, and the evidently malignant account of the Egyptian *Manetho* (about 280 years before Christ, ap. Joseph. c. Apion. I. 26, comp. 14.). They were afterwards repeated in various versions by the Egyptian *Chæremon* (in the time of Augustus, ap. Joseph. l. c. 32), *Lysimachus* (ibid. c. 34), *Justin* (hist. 36, 2), and *Tacitus* (hist. V. c. 2). Josephus wrote his two books against Apion in order to contradict these injurious traditions concerning his nation.

6 Namely, concerning the object of their worship. Many, it is true, supposed Jehovah to be the same with Jupiter: *Varro* ap. Augustin. de consensu evangel. I. 22. *Aristeas* de legis divinæ interpr. historia, p. 3: τὸν γὰρ πάντων ἐπόπτην καὶ κτίστην θεὸν οὗτοι σέβονται, ὃν καὶ πάντες, ἡμεῖς δὲ μάλιστα, προσονομάζοντες ἑτέρως Ζῆνα. Others, however, supposed that the Jews worshipped the heaven (*Juven.* Sat. XIV. 97. Nil præter nubes et cœli numen adorant); others, Bacchus (*Plutarch.* Sympos. IV. Qu. 5. *Tac.* hist. 5, 5.); others, an ass's head (*Apion* ap. Jos. c. Ap. II. 7. *Tacit.* hist. 5, 4. *Plut.* l. c.); others, a swine (*Plutarch.* l. c. *Petronius* in fragm.: Judæus, licet et Porcinum numen adoret etc.) — There was also a fable that the Jews sacrificed a Greek every year, and ate of his flesh (Joseph. c. Apion. II. 8). — *Io. Iac. Huldrici* gentilis obtrectator s. de calumniis gentilium in Judæos et in primævos Christianos. Tiguri. 1744. 8vo.

§ 17.

CONDITION OF THE JEWS OUT OF PALESTINE.

J. Remond Geschichte der Ausbreitung des Judenthums von Cyrus bis auf den gänzlichen Untergang des jüd. Staats. Leipz. 1789. 8vo. Jost's Gesch. d. Israeliten. Th. 2. S. 262 ff. [Milman, &c. as prefixed to § 15.]

The Jews, however, were by no means confined to Palestine. The permission of Cyrus to return to Judea had induced only the smaller part of them to forsake Babylon. A great number remained behind, and without doubt spread themselves farther east, so that in the first century their numbers were very great (*οὐκ ὀλίγαι μυριάδες*, Jos. Ant. xv. 3, 1.). In Arabia the Jewish religion was adopted by the kings of the Homerites (about 100 B. C.), and somewhat later by the princes of Adiabene, beginning with King Izates about the time of the birth of Christ (vid. Jos. Antiq. xx. 2.). Alexander the Great founded a Jewish colony in his new city of Alexandria (Jos. de bello Jud. ii. 36.); other colonies were introduced into Egypt, Cyrene, and Lybia by Ptolemy Lagi (Jos. Ant. xii. 2, 4.), and became very numerous (one million, Philo ad Flacc. p. 971 — in Alexandria two-fifths of the population, ibid. p. 973.), as well as rich and powerful. Jewish colonists were likewise carried into Syria by Seleucus Nicanor (Jos. Ant. xii. 3, 1.), particularly to Antioch, where afterwards a great part of the population were Jews (Jos. de bello Jud. vii. 3, 3.). Antiochus the Great, having sent a Jewish colony to Phrygia and Lydia (Jos. l. c.), they spread themselves thence over all Asia Minor, as well as Greece.

The Jews were first brought to Rome as prisoners of war by Pompey. Afterwards they received their freedom (therefore called *libertini*, Philo de legat. ad Cai. 1014. Tacit. Ann. ii. 85), were allowed by Julius Cæsar to build Synagogues (Jos. Ant. xiv. 10, 8.), and soon occupied the greater part of the city on the other side of the Tiber (Philo loco citato). Thus in the time of our Saviour it would not have been easy to find a place in the whole Roman empire in which there were no Jews (Strabo xiv. c. 12.).[1]

All these widely dispersed portions of the nation (*ἡ διασπορά*) looked on Jerusalem as their chief city, and the Sanhedrim of Jerusalem as their ecclesiastical rulers. They not only sent their yearly contributions and offerings to the temple (Philo in Flacc. 971; legat. ad Cai. 1014, 1023, 1031. Cicero pro Flacco 12. Tac. hist. 5, 5.), but made frequent visits at the great festivals, though Onias had built them a temple at Leontopolis (152 B. C.).[2] In all the places where they had originally gone at the instance of the princes of the country, especial

---

1 Philo de legat. ad Cai. p. 1031.

2 Though the building of the temple by Onias was opposed by the Jews of Palestine, it was as far from creating a schism in the nation as the differences of opinion between the Pharisees and Sadducees.

privileges were granted them; and even in Rome Cæsar had secured to them their religious liberty,[3] and in various ways favored the observance of their law.[4] But all these distinctions served only to make them still more hated by their fellow-citizens, with whom therefore they were involved in almost perpetual disputes. Still by this wide extension the Jewish Religion made many proselytes. Many, who were disgusted with the absurdities of Polytheism, worshipped the only true God, without joining themselves to the nation by the rite of circumcision. These proselytes were most numerous in the female sex, so that in Damascus, for instance, nearly all the women were converts.[5] Nor was Judaism forgotten at Rome in the general propensity to foreign superstitions. Jewish ceremonies appear to have been common there, though those who attended them had not always renounced their Paganism, and could not therefore be considered actual proselytes.[6]

At the same time the constant intercourse with the Pagans was not without its influence on the Jews, smoothing down by degrees the rough points of the national character, and leading them to partake in the cultivation of the nations amongst whom they lived. In Alexandria, especially, under the Ptolemies, the Jews were led by the study of philosophy to peculiar views of their religion, and a kind of

---

3 This included their synagogues in the class of Collegia licita (see § 12). Comp. the decree of the Prætor C. Julius ap. *Joseph.* Ant. XIV, 10, 8: Γάϊος Καῖσαρ, ὁ ἡμετέρος στρατηγὸς καὶ ὕπατος ἐν τῷ διατάγματι κωλύων θιάσους συνάγεσθαι κατὰ πόλιν, μόνους τούτους οὐκ ἐκώλυσεν οὔτε χρήματα συνεισφέρειν, οὔτε σύνδειπνα ποιεῖν. ὁμοίως δὲ κἀγὼ τοὺς ἄλλους θιάσους κωλύων τούτους μόνους ἐπιτρέπω κατὰ τὰ πάτρια ἔθη καὶ νόμιμα συνάγεσθαί τε καὶ ἵστασθαι. So also Augustus (*Philo* de legat. ad Caium, p. 1035, 1036.)

4 Comp. Jos. Ant. XIV, 10, 2 seq. — What was granted them and what required from them is briefly given in the edict of Claudius (Jos. Ant. XIX, 5, 3): Ἰουδαίους τοὺς ἐν παντὶ τῷ ὑφ' ἡμᾶς κόσμῳ τὰ πάτρια ἔθη ἀνεπικωλύτως φυλάσσειν, — καὶ μὴ τὰς τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν δεισιδαιμονίας ἐξουθενίζειν. Decreta Romana et Asiatica pro Judæis ad cultum div. — secure obeundum — restituta a *Jac. Gronovio.* Lugd. Bat. 1712. 8vo. Decreta Romanorum pro Judæis e Josepho collecta a *J. Tob. Krebs.* Lips. 1768. 8vo.

5 Joseph. de Bello Jud. II. 20. 2. Act. xiii. 50; xvii. 4. Comp. Strabo VII. c. 3. § 4.

6 Horat. Sat. I. 9, 69.

— — hodie tricesima sabbata: vin' tu
Curtis Judæis oppedere? Nulla mihi, inquam,
Religio est. At mî: sum paulo infirmior, unus
Multorum; — — — — —

comp. Juven. Sat. VI. 541 seq. On the other hand, there were some who had embraced Judaism more seriously. Tacit. hist. V. 5: Circumcidere genitalia instituere, ut diversitate noscantur. Transgressi in morem eorum idem usurpant, nec quidquam prius imbuuntur, quam contemnere deos, exuere patriam: parentes, liberos, fratres vilia habere, though it would seem that Jews and Christians are here confounded, (especially in the following: animasque, prœlio aut suppliciis peremtorum æternas putant; hinc generandi amor et *moriendi contemptus*). — *Seneca de superstitionibus* (Fragm. ap. Augustin. de civit. Dei VI. 11): Cum interim usque eo sceleratissimæ gentis consuetudo convaluit, ut per omnes jam terras recepta sit, *victi victoribus leges dederunt.* Illi tamen causas ritus sui noverunt, sed major pars populi facit, quod cur faciat ignorat.

religious philosophy, which may be traced in Aristobulus (about 160 years before Christ), the book of the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Therapeutæ, down to the time of Philo (+ A. D. 40 or later). Though Philo's Platonizing Judaism[7] in its full extent was confined perhaps to a few, yet the general ideas which pervade it were very common amongst the Hellenistic Jews of that time. Nor could this philosophy fail to exert some influence also on Christianity, as being of all existing systems, the most congenial to its spirit.

§ 18.

SAMARITANS.

The mixed people (*Samaritans*) occupying the tract of country belonging to the tribes of Israel before their captivity (2 Kings xvii. 24 seq.) had always been regarded with peculiar abhorrence by the Jews on account of the mixture of Judaism and Paganism, of which their religion at first consisted. And though afterwards, under the direction of the Jewish priest Manasseh, they received the Pentateuch, built a temple on Mount Gerizim, established a Levitical priesthood, and, in short, adopted Judaism in all its particulars, as it then was,[1] this served only to increase the hatred of the Jews against them, notwithstanding that they were bound together not only by near neighbourhood, but by a common religion and a similar fate. This hatred on the part of the Jews (which the Samaritans do not seem, however, to have returned with equal virulence) was far from

---

[7] Opp. ed. Francofurti, 1691. fol. (the ed. usually cited). The best ed. that of *Thomas Mangey.* Lond. 1742. 2 vols. fol. -- Philo's opinions are given by E. H. Stahl, in Eichhorn's Bibliothek der bibl. Literatur, Bd. 4. St. 5. S. 770; and Neander's Kirchengeschichte, Bd. 1. Abth. 1. S. 60 ff. [Neander's Hist. of the Church. Vol. I. p. 50.]

The Therapeutæ have often been supposed to be Christian ascetics, though without sufficient authority. Thus Euseb. hist. eccl. II. 17, and all who followed him, with the exception of *Photius*, cod. 104. Since the Reformation, also, most of the older historians of the Catholic church, and church of England, even *Bernard de Montfaucon* (not. ad Philon. de vit. contempl.) and *L. M. Muratori* (Anecdot. Græc. p. 330). Witness the controversy between the former and *Jo. Bouhier*: Lettres pour et contre sur la fameuse question, si les solitaires appellés Thérapeutes — — étoient Chrétiens. Paris. 1712. 8vo. — Philo himself is said to have contracted a friendship with Peter in Rome (εἰς ὁμιλίαν ἐλθεῖν Πέτρῳ. Euseb. l. c. Hieron. catal. 11.), out of which grew the fable that he was made a convert to Christianity, but afterwards forsook it (Photius cod. 105), cf. *Mangey*, præf. in Phil. Opp. [Vid. Prideaux's Conn. III. 467. Neander's Hist. of the Church, I. 52. — Tr.]

[1] Josephus, Ant. XI. 7, 2. 8, 2. 4, 6. places the defection of Manasseh in the time of Darius Codomannus. In that case the events mentioned Nehem. xiii. 28, must have happened twice. Jahn therefore supposes (Bibl. Archæology, Part 2. Vol. 1.) that Josephus by some mistake has put that in the time of Darius Codom., which belonged in the time of Darius Nothus. Comp. *Gesenius* de pentateuchi Samaritani origine, indole, et auctoritate. Halæ. 1815. 4to. [See *Prof. Stuart* on the Samaritan language and literature, in Bibl. Repository, Vol. II. p. 68. And. 1832. N. Am. Review for April, 1826. — Tr.]

being allayed by the destruction of the temple on Mount Gerizim by John Hyrcanus (109 B. C.), but was carried into Egypt, where Alexander and Ptolemy Lagi had planted colonies of both nations,[2] and it had continued to the latest times.

The Samaritans held firmly to the ancient Hebraism, as delivered to them by Manasseh, and always therefore remained strangers to the modern additions of the Jews.[3] Neither was there any thing in their history to call forth that arrogance and hatred of every thing foreign by which the Jews were distinguished.[4] Thus they escaped the narrow and worldly views of God's purposes with regard to the favored nation, and of the Messiah's character and office, which had grown out of this inflated pride, and were led to a purer and more spiritual view of their religion.[5] This spiritual tendency was doubtless in-

---

2 Such colonies were planted in Thebais by Alexander (Joseph. Ant. XI. 8, 6), and in Lower Egypt and Alexandria by Ptolemy Lagi (Jos. l. c. XII. 1.). Josephus, l. c. XIII. 3, 4, gives the history of a controversy between the Jews and Samaritans in Alexandria.

3 The incorrect notions of the Church fathers concerning the doctrines of the Samaritans may be seen from *Philastrius* (de hær. cap. 7), *Epiphanius* (hær. 6), and *Leontius* (de sectis c. 8). They supposed, for instance, that the Samaritans denied the resurrection, and the immortality of the soul. These mistakes were corrected by the letters of the Samaritans to J. J. Scaliger (A. D. 1589), to the scholars of Oxford brought by Robert Huntington (A. D. 1671), to J. Ludolf (A. D. 1684), (all these may be found in Eichhorn's Repertorium für bibl. und morgenländische Literatur. Th. 9 and 13.), and to De Sacy (since A. D. 1808.) comp. *Sylv. de Stacy*, Mémoire sur l'état actuel des Samaritains. Paris. 1812. — republished by De Sacy in the Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibl. Royale. T. XI Paris. 1829. The publication of the Samaritan Pentateuch, also, with the Samaritan and Arabic translations, was of great importance for the knowledge of their opinions. Still many points in their theology remained somewhat obscure, till *W. Gesenius* de Samaritanorum theologia ex fontibus ineditis comm. (Halle. 1822. 4to.) made use of the Samaritan manuscripts at Oxford, namely, the liturgia Damascena, to throw light on what was doubtful, and to give a complete view of the Samaritan theology. The Carmina Samaritana e codd. Londinensibus et Gothanis ed. et illustr. Guil. Gesenius. Lips. 1824. belong to the time of the Arabs.

4 Hence Josephus brings the accusation against them (Ant. XI. 8, 6): *εἰσὶ οἱ Σαμαρεῖς ποιοῦντοι τὴν φύσιν, ἐν μὲν ταῖς συμφοραῖς ὄντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἀρνοῦνται συγγενεῖς ἔχειν, ὁμολογοῦντες τότε τὴν ἀλήθειαν. ὅταν δέ τι περὶ αὐτοὺς λαμπρὸν ἴδωσιν ἐκ τύχης, ἐξαίφνης ἐπιπηδῶσιν αὐτῶν τῇ κοινωνίᾳ, προσήκειν αὐτοῖς λέγοντες καὶ ἐκ τῶν Ἰωσήπου γενεαλογοῦντες αὐτοὺς ἐκγόνων Ἐφραίμου καὶ Μανασσοῦ.* So too they are said to have reported themselves to Alexander, *Ἑβραῖοι μὲν εἶναι, χρηματίζειν δ' οἱ ἐν Σικίμοις Σιδώνιοι* (Joseph. l. c.), but, on the other hand, to Antiochus Epiphanes as *ὄντες τὸ ἀνέκαθεν Σιδώνιοι* (Joseph. Ant. XII. 5, 5.). So too he accuses them of having screened themselves from the danger which threatened them under this king, by calling their temple *ἱερὸν Διὸς Ἑλληνίου·* though without making any change in their worship. Joseph. l. c. comp. 2 Macc. vi. 2.

5 They held a strict Monotheism, avoiding all human conceptions of the Deity (Gesenius de theol. Samar. p. 12 seq.), as is seen in their Pentateuch (Gesenius de Pentat. Samar. p. 58, seq.) — The angels they held to be purely spiritual beings, חילין (חֵילִים *δύναμεις.*) — They magnified the writings of Moses, and rejected the later prophetic writings altogether. — They considered the Sabbath and the circumcision as the most important pledges of the covenant with Jehovah. — The temple on Mount Gerizim they supposed to be the only true one. (Deut. xxvii. 4, עֵיבָל changed to גַּרְזִים. Gesenius de Pent. Sam.

creased by intercourse with their countrymen in Alexandria, who were deeply versed in the Greek philosophy. But the political misfortunes of the country were too constant to allow its full developement. In the first century, however, there arose amongst the Samaritans no less than three founders of sects; — *Dositheus*,[6] whose system varied little from the popular notions; *Simon Magus*,[7] the germs of whose system were probably taken from the Alexandrian philosophy, — the manner of their developement being suggested perhaps by Christianity; and *Menander*,[8] the pupil of Simon Magus, who trod nearly in the footsteps of his master. All three left behind them sects, which survived for centuries. The followers of Simon and Menander were often confounded with Christians by the Heathen,[9] and when Christianity had become the prevailing religion they in fact attempted to insinuate themselves into the church.[10]

---

p. 61). The life after the resurrection was to be wholly different from the present. — The Messiah (הַשֵּׁתֵב or הַתֵּב Gesenius de theol. Sam. p. 44: reductor, conversor) probably יָבֵן would lead the people to repentance, and then to happiness; the nations would believe on him, and so be won over to the law, and to worship on Mount Gerizim (comp. John iv. 25.).

6 *Moshemii* institut. hist. Christ. majores. Sæc. I. p. 376 – 389. [Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I. p. 112. 72. — Tr.] Dositheus pretended to be the prophet who is promised, Deut. xviii. 18. The Church fathers ascribe to him peculiarly many doctrines, which had always been held by the Samaritans. He was chiefly distinguished by an ascetic life, and an over-scrupulous observance of the Sabbath. *Origen.* de princ. IV. c. 17: Quo quisque corporis situ in principio sabbathi inventus fuerit, in eo ad vesperum usque ipsi permanendum esse, which originated evidently in the verbal interpretation of Exodus xvi. 29. — As late as the year 588 the followers of Dositheus were engaged in a controversy with the other Samaritans concerning the passage, Deut. xviii. 18. (Eulogius ap. Phot. bibl. cod. 230.)

7 *Mosheim*, l. c. p. 389 – 432. Walchs Historie der Ketzereyen, Th. 1. S. 135 ff. A. Neanders genetische Entwickelung der vornehmsten gnostischen Systeme. Berlin. 1818. S. 338 ff — Acts viii. 9. 10. *Σίμων – μαγεύων καὶ ἐξιστῶν τὸ ἔθνος τῆς Σαμαρείας, λέγων εἶναι τινὰ ἑαυτὸν μέγαν.* By the populace he was considered as *ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ μεγάλη* (חַיִל comp. note 5). Probably the *Σίμων Ἰουδαῖος, Κύπριος δὲ γένος, μάγος εἶναι σκηπτόμενος*, Joseph. Ant. XX. 7, 2. — The fabulous accounts of his death at Rome (fiist found in Arnobius II. c. 12.), were perhaps occasioned by the event related Sueton. in Nerone, c. 12. Juvenal. Sat. III. 79, 80. — The statue on the island in the Tiber mentioned by Justin. M. Apol. II. p. 69, 91, with the inscription *Simoni Sancto Deo*, was found in the year 1574, and has upon it: *Semoni Sango Deo Fidio Sacrum etc.* (Baronius ad ann. 44. § 55.) Concerning Semo Sancus or Sangus comp. Ovid. fast. VI. 213. — Simon was always considered as the master and father of all heretics (Irenæus adv. hær. 1, 27. II. præf.), and has been sometimes cited as the first heresiarch. — The system, which has been attributed to him, first set forth in the Recognition. Clementis, was probably developed by degrees in his school, in correspondence with the Christian Gnosis.

8 See Mosheim, l. c. 432 – 438.

9 See Justin. Apol. II. p. 70.

10 Concerning the followers of Simon, see Euseb. hist. eccl. I. 1, 4. Concerning the followers of Menander, III. 26, 2.

§ 19.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE TIME CONSIDERED IN REFERENCE TO CHRISTIANITY.

From this general view then it appears that in the time of our Saviour the popular religions of the *Heathen* had become superannuated, whilst the prevailing superstition and unbelief threatened the utter extinction of all true religious feeling; and that *Judaism* was daily losing more and more of its spiritual character, till there seemed good reason to fear that it would degenerate into a mere religion of forms. It was natural therefore that amongst the Heathen, on the one hand, men should long for something to end their doubts and uncertainties, to satisfy the cravings of their moral nature, and give them peace; whilst, from its Oriental origin, Christianity was sure soon to attract their attention. Amongst the Jews, on the other hand, there must have been many who felt the emptiness of their ceremonial service, especially as in many passages of their own prophets they found an admonition to a more spiritual worship, and here the way was prepared for Christianity by the prevailing expectations of a Messiah.

But much as there might be in the circumstances of the times to further the progress of Christianity, there was no less to retard and impede it. Amongst the Jews their national pride, their hopes of a worldly Messiah, and their almost entirely ceremonial worship: amongst the Heathen, skepticism as well as superstition; prejudice against every thing of Jewish origin, and the political grounds for holding fast the national religion. From the Roman government Christianity could only expect toleration as long as it was confined to the Jews. But a religion, which, whilst like the Jewish it declared all other religions to be false, was not confined to any one nation, but was making its way over the whole world, and threatening the extinction of every other mode of worship, could not be admitted at Rome without an entire revolution in the religion of the state.

The toleration of philosophical systems and foreign superstitions argued nothing in favor of Christianity, for all these were consistent with an external conformity at least to the national religion.[1]

---

1 This is to be taken into consideration in judging of the views, which have become very common since Voltaire's Traité sur la tolérance, 1763. c. 8 – 10; concerning the tolerance of the Romans, and consequently the certainty that the Christians must have brought their persecutions on themselves.

CHAPTER FIRST.

THE LIFE OF JESUS.

J. J. Hess Lebensgeschichte Jesu. 3 Bde. 8te Aufl. Zürich. 1822-23. 8vo. — The same: Lehre, Thaten, u. Schicksale unseres Herrn, von verschiedenen Seiten beleuchtet. 3te Aufl. Zürich. 1817. 8vo. — J. G. Herder Vom Erlöser der Menschen nach unsern 3 ersten Evangel. Riga. 1796. 8vo. — The same: Von Gottes Sohn der Welt Heiland, nach Johannis Evangel. Riga. 1797. 8vo. — J. B. N. Hacker Jesus der Weise von Nazareth. Leipz. 2 Th. 1800-1803. — J. Ch. Greiling das Leben Jesu von Nazareth. Halle. 1815. 8vo. — Dr. K. Hase das Leben Jesu. Leipz. 1829. 8vo.

F. V. Reinhard Versuch über den Plan, den der Stifter der christlichen Religion zum Besten der Menschen entwarf. 5te Ausg. (with additions by Heubner) Wittenberg. 1830. [Plan of the founder of Christianity. And. 1831. 12mo.] G. J. Planck Gesch. des Christenthums in der Periode seiner ersten Einführung in die Welt durch Jesum u. die Apostel. Göttingen. 1818. 2 Bde. 8vo.

J. A. G. Meyer Versuch einer Vertheidigung u. Erläuterung der Geschichte Jesu u. der Apostel allein aus griech. u. röm. Profanscribenten 1805. 8vo. — [G. Benson's Hist. of the Life of Christ. 4to. 1764. — Ed. Harwood's Life and Character of Christ. 1772. 8vo. — Jer. Taylor's Life of Christ. fol. Lond. 1657. — Rob. Wait's Gospel Hist. Ed. 1765. 8vo. — David Hunter's Observations on the Hist. of J. C. 2 vols. 12mo. Ed. 1770. — Tr.]

§ 20.

CHRONOLOGICAL DATA RELATING TO THE LIFE OF JESUS.

The only plain and certain date given in the gospel history[1] is that of John's appearance, Luke iii. 1.* It may be taken for granted that, as Jesus was born six months after John, he also appeared in public six months after him. The mention of our Saviour's age in Luke iii. 23, at the time of his public appearance, therefore, gives us nearly

[1] The following seeming dates have been proved insufficient: Luke i. 5, 'of the course of Abia,' (comp. 1 Chron. xxiv. 10. Jos. Scaliger de emendat. temporum. App. p. 54. comp. Paulus comm. über die drei ersten Evangel. Th. 1. S. 36 ff.) — Luke ii. 2, 'this taxing was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria,' (comp. Jos. Ant. XVIII. 1, 1. Paulus, as just cited, p. 141. ff.) — John ii. 20, 'forty and six years was this temple in building,' (comp. Jos. Ant. XV. 11, 1; XX. 9, 7. Lampe, Paulus, and Lücke comm. ad h. l.)

* In Bd. 2. S. 5 ff. of Bengel's Archiv für die Theologie, it is shown by J. F. Wurm that Augustus died on the 19th of August, A. D. 14, and that the fifteenth year of Tiberius was therefore from the 19th of Aug. A. D. 28, to the 19th of August, A. D. 29.

the time of his birth; which we can approximate a little more by remembering, that it must have been at some time previous to the death of Herod (Matt. ii. 1. 19.),[2] which was just before the Passover, A. U. 750. Though in the first centuries of the Christian church we find various dates given as the year of our Saviour's birth.[3] Dionysius Exiguus (A. D. 525.) first used this date for the purpose of calculating an era, assuming it with exclusive regard to the notices found in Luke, (A. U. 754.) Thus this Æra Dionysiana, which first appeared in the Easter-Cyclus of Dionysius, and was afterwards more generally made known by Beda Venerabilis, and introduced into public affairs by Pepin and Charlemagne, places our Saviour's birth at least three years too late.[4] — The particular day cannot be fixed.[5]

It was supposed by many of the ancient Church fathers, on the strength of Isaiah lxi. 1, 2. (comp. Luke iv. 19), that our Saviour was employed only one year in teaching; [6] and on this supposition was

---

2 An account of the opinions concerning the year of our Saviour's birth may be found in *Fabricii* Bibl. antiquaria. ed. 2. Hamb. 1716. 4to. p. 187 seq. — continued in F. Münter, der Stern der Weisen. Kop. 1827. S. 109. The latest investigations have resulted for the most part in fixing this event in the year 747 A. U.: e. g. *Henr. Sanclementii* de vulgaris Æræ emendatione libb. IV. Romæ. 1793, solely on historical grounds: F. Münter as above cited on the same grounds, and also on the supposition suggested by Kepler, that the star of the wise men was the great conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in Pisces, which fell in that year: Ideler, Chronologie, Bd. 2. S. 394 ff. adopts the same opinions. On the other hand, comp. Wurm in Klaibers Studien d. evang. Geistlichk. Wirtembergs. Bd. 1. Heft. 2. (Stuttg. 1828.) S. 211 ff.

3 *Irenæus* III. 25, and *Tertullian* adv. Jud. 8, give the 41st year of Augustus, 751 A. U. On the other hand, *Clemens Alex.* Strom. I. p. 339, gives the 28th year after the conquest of Africa, or the 42d of Augustus, 752 A. U.; with whom *Euseb.* h. e. I. 5. *Epiphan.* hær. LI. 22, and *Orosius* histor. I. 1, agree. — *Sulpicius Severus* hist. sacr. II. 27, gives the 33d year of Herod, Coss. Sabino et Rufino (which cannot be, as Sab. and Ruf. were consuls 751 A. U., and Herod died, after a reign of 37 years, 751 A. U.) — *Panodorus*, an Egyptian monk (who lived at some time after A. D. 400), places the birth of Christ in the year 5493 of his era, i. e. 754 A. U. (G. Syncelli Chronographia, ed. Paris. p. 25. 326.)

4 *G. A. Hamberger* de epochæ Christianæ ortu et auctore. Jenæ. 1688. 4to. (In *Martini* thesaur. dissertatt. T. III. P. I. p. 241.) *Jo. G. Jani* historia Æræ Dionysianæ. Viteb. 1715. 4to. [Playfair's Chronology, p. 50. Edinb. 1784. fol. — Tr.]

5 *Clem. Alex.* Strom. I. p. 340, relates that some adopted the 25th Pachon (20 May), others the 24th or 25th Pharmuthi (19th or 20th Apr.), as the birth-day of our Saviour. In the East, the 6th of January was adopted as the birth-day of Christ from the followers of Basilides. (Epiphan. hær. LI. 24.) In the West, the 25th December began to be celebrated as the anniversary of that event from the 4th century. (Sulpic. Sever. hist. sacr. II. 27.)

6 So the Valentinians (Iren. II. 38, 39). In opposition to whom Irenæus maintains the strange assertion that though Jesus was baptized in his 30th year, he did not appear openly as a teacher till between his 40th and 50th year (John viii. 57), and then taught three years. One year, however, was adopted by *Clem. Alex.* Strom. I. 340; *Origenes* hom. 32 in Lucam and de Princip. IV. (on the other hand, c. Celsum II. p. 397 and Comm. in Matth. xxiv. 15, he says that Judas was not quite three years with Jesus); *Auct. Clementin.* hom. 17 in fine; *Julius Africanus* (ap. Hieronym. in Dan. ix.); *Philastrius* hær. 106; *Cyrill. Alex.* in Esaiam, c. 32. Some modern writers have arrived at the same result by dif-

founded the tradition in the ancient church that Jesus was crucified in his 30th year, Consulibus Rubellio Gemino et Rufio Gemino[7] (in the 15th year of Tiberius — 30 Ær. Dionys.). But according to the Gospel of John there occurred three and perhaps four feasts of the Passover (John ii. 13; [v. 1;] vi. 4; xi. 55.) during the time of our Saviour's teaching: it must therefore have been more than two years, and perhaps three. Thus the year of his death is somewhere between the 31st and 33d of the Ær. Dionys.,[8] making his age 34 to 38 years. From the uncertainty of the Jewish calendar of that time, it is impossible to find, by an exact astronomical reckoning, in which of these years the first day of the Passover fell on a Friday,[9] even if the previous question were settled (which it by no means is), whether the Friday on which Jesus died was the day before the Passover, or the first day of the feast.

§ 21.

EARLY HISTORY OF JESUS.

Of the history of our Saviour before his public appearance very little is known,[1] and we have no means whatever of tracing the man-

---

ferent means. *Priestley's* Harmony of the Evangelists in Greek, 1777. *Haenlein* progr. de temporis, quo Iesus cum Apostolis versatus est, duratione. Erlang. 1796. 4to.

7 *Tertull.* adv. Jud. 8. (comp. adv. Marcion. 1, 15.) *Lactant.* institutt. IV. 10. *Augustin.* de civ. Dei XVIII. 54. de Trinit. IV. 5. That Christ was 30 years old is shown by *Hippolytus Portuensis* in Canone paschali. — *Chronicon Anonymi* (in Canis. lect. antiq. T. II.) c. 17 and 18. — *Hieronym.* epist. 22 ad Eustochium. — *Augustin.* epist. 80 and 99. Comp. *Petavii* rationarium temporum (ed. Lugd. 1745.) P. II. pag. 266 seq.

8 *Bynæus* de morte J. C. libb. 3. Amst. 1691–98. 3 voll. 4to. Paulus über die Möglichkeit Jesu Todesjahr zu bestimmen, in his Comm. über d. N. T. 2d ed. Th 3. S. 784 ff. Wurm in Bengels Archiv f. d. Theologie. Bd. 2. S. 261 ff.

9 The first three Evangelists describe the last supper as the Passover (Matth. xxvi. 17 seq.; Mark xiv. 12; Luke xxii. 7); and hence it has been supposed in the Western church that Jesus was crucified on the first day of the feast. On the other hand, according to John xiii. 1, 29; xviii. 28; xix. 14, 31, the crucifixion was on the day before the Passover, which supposition is adopted by Tertull. adv. Jud. c. 8, by the Greeks, by Scaliger, Casaubon, Capellus, Lampe, Kuinoel, and others. It is a strong argument in favor of the latter hypothesis, that according to the present calendar of the Jews, the first day of the Passover must never be on a Friday. See Ideler's Chronologie. Bd. 1. S. 519. The variance in the accounts of the Evangelists has been explained with much probability by supposing that the first three looked on the last supper as the Christian Passover. See Theile in Winer's Krit. Journal der theol. Literatur. Bd. 2. S. 123 ff.; Bd. 5. S. 129 ff. Comp. Hase Leben Jesu. S. 167.

1 C. F. Ammons bibl. Theologie, Bd. 2. S. 244 ff. Paulus Commentar. über d. N. T. Th. 1. Schleiermacher über d. Schriften d. Lucas. Th. 1. Berlin. 1817. S. 23 ff. [On the writings of Luke. Lond. 1825.] In later times the history of the youth of Jesus was adorned with various fictions. As early as the 2d century Irenæus (adv. hær. 1. 17.) found writings of this kind amongst the Marcosians. The orthodox church were interested in supporting these traditions in order to confute those of the Gnostics, who maintained that the Æon was first united with Jesus at the baptism. (Epiphan. hær. LI. 20.) Various

ner, or the course, in which his character was developed. In modern times learned men have attempted to supply this deficiency by conjectures, attributing a decided influence, now to the Essenes,[2] now to the Sadducees,[3] now to a comparison of the doctrines of the Pharisees and Sadducees,[4] and partly to his education amongst the Alexandrian Jews.[5] But such a spirit can never have been essentially influenced by any school, and least of all by the schools of that day, which by their mere formal adherence to the letter on the one hand, and their fanatical extravagance on the other, were more suited to shackle the mind than to prepare it to develope its own latent powers. On the other hand, the reading of the prophets of the Old Testament must have inspired in his kindred mind a religion as spiritual as that of the time was formal and fleshly, and at the same time may well have led him to a view of the state of his nation and the means of again exalting it very different from the prevailing notions on these subjects.

§ 22.

JOHN THE BAPTIST.

Wm. Bell's Inquiry into the Divine Mission of John the Baptist and Jesus Christ. Lond. 1761. 8vo. — J. G. E. Leopold, Johannes, der Taufer, eine bibl. Untersuchung. 1825. 8vo Hannover.

Jesus was preceded by one of his relatives, John, who appeared in the wilderness of Judea, preaching repentance, and consecrating his followers by a symbolical purification of the body by water.[1]

---

fictions of the kind are to be found in the Koran (cf. Augusti christologiæ Coranicæ lineamenta. Jen. 1799.) The *evangelia infantiæ* now extant are the *evangelium Thomæ* and an Arabic *evangel. infant.* ed Henricus Sike Traj. ad Rh. 1697. Like fables have also been invented of the Virgin Mary. All these are collected in the *Protevangelium Jacobi minoris, evangelium de nativitate Mariæ*, and the Arabic *historia Josephi, fabri lignarii* (ed. G. Wallinus. Lips. 1722. 4to.) Cf. *J. A. Fabricii* codex Apocryphus N. T. 3 Th. 1719. 8vo. — *And. Birch* auctarium codicis Apocryphi N. T. Fabriciani fasc. I. 1804. 8vo.

2 So first the *English Deists* (answered by Prideaux, Conn. III. 478. Charlest. Mass. 1816. 8vo.) From them it was adopted (with many other things) by *Voltaire* dictionn. philos. article *Esséniens.* — *Frederick the Great*, œuvres ed. Berlin. T. XI. p 94. — Stäudlin Geschichte der Sittenlehre Jesu. Th. 1. S. 570 ff. — On the other side, Bengel über den Versuch das Christenthum aus dem Essenismus abzuleiten (in Flatts Magazin für Dogm. u. Mor. St. 7. S. 148 ff.) The hypothesis of Voltaire, &c. has been still further carried out by A. C. Richter das Christenthum u. die ältesten Religionen des Orients. Leipz. 1819. He supposes Christianity to have been only the publication of the doctrines of the Essenes, that these were connected with the ancient schools of the prophets, with Parsism, and so with the religion of Brama.

3 Des-Cotes Schutzschrift für Jesum von Nazareth. Frankf. 1797.

4 Versuch den Ursprung der Sittenlehre Jesu historisch zu erklären (in Henkes Magazin, Bd. 5. S. 426.)

5 Bahrdts Briefe über die Bibel im Volkstone. Berlin. 1784 ff.

1 The baptism of John is supposed to have been taken from an already exist-

There can be little doubt that Jesus and John, as relatives, were personally acquainted with each other, though it is wholly improbable that they were leagued together, or had concerted any plan of action. The peculiarities of John indicate a former connexion with the Essenes;[2] and the same character may be traced in his disciples, who always remained distinct from the disciples of Jesus (John iii. 26; Luke v. 33; Matth. ix. 14; xi. 2 seq.), and of whom we find traces long after their master[3] had fallen a victim to his boldness (Acts xviii. 25; xix. 1 seq.).[4]

---

ing custom among the Jews. See *Buxtorf* lexic. Talmud. p. 408. *Lightfoot*, *Schoettgen*, *Wetstein* ad Math. iii. 6. *J. J. A. Danz* baptismus proselytorum Judaicus ad illustrandum baptismum Joannis, and *ejusd.* antiquitas baptismi initiationis Israelitarum vindicata. (Both contained in *Meuschen* N. T. ex talmude illustratum. Lips. 1736. 4to. pag. 233 and 287 seq.) W. C. L. Ziegler über die Johannistaufe als unveränderte, Anwendung der jüdischen Proselytentaufe (in his theological treatises. Bd. 2. Gottingen. 1804. S. 132 ff.) — Others, on the contrary, deny that the custom of baptizing proselytes existed among the Jews before the time of John. Vid. Paulus comment. Th. 1. S. 278, *De Wette* comment. de morte J. C. expiatoria. Berol. 1813. p. 42 ff. A third party, E. G. Bengel über das Alter der jüdischen Proselytentaufe. Tübingen. 1814. 8vo. (in which a list of the works on this subject may be found), *J. G. Reiche* de baptismatis origine et necessitate necnon de formula baptismali. Goetting. 1816. 8vo., adopt a middle course.

2 Even the place of his appearing, ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῆς Ἰουδαίας (Matth. iii. 1.), where, according to Plin. hist. nat. V. c. 17, the Essenes also dwelt.

3 See the remarkable testimony concerning John, Joseph. Ant. XVIII. 5. 2. (mentioned first by Orig. c. Cels I. p. 35.) Κτείνει τοῦτον (Ἰωάννην) Ἡρώδης, ἀγαθὸν ἄνδρα, καὶ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους κελεύοντα, ἀρετὴν ἐπασκοῦντας, καὶ τῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλους δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εὐσεβείᾳ χρωμένους, βαπτισμῷ συνιέναι· οὕτω γὰρ καὶ τὴν βάπτισιν ἀποδεκτὴν αὐτῷ φανεῖσθαι, μὴ ἐπί τινων ἁμαρτάδων παραιτήσει χρωμένων, ἀλλ' ἐφ' ἁγνείᾳ τοῦ σώματος ἅτι δὴ καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς δικαιοσύνῃ προεκκεκαθαρμένης. καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συστρεφομένων, καὶ γὰρ ἥδεσθαι ἐπὶ πλεῖστον τῇ ἀκροάσει τῶν λόγων, δείσας Ἡρώδης τὸ ἐπὶ τοσόνδε πιθανὸν αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις μὴ ἐπὶ ἀποστάσει τινὶ φέροι, πάντα γὰρ ἐῴκεισαν συμβουλῇ τῇ ἐκείνου πράξοντες, πολὺ κρεῖττον ἡγεῖται, πρίν τι νεώτερον ἐξ αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι, προλαβὼν ἀναιρεῖν, ἢ μεταβολῆς γενομένης εἰς τὰ πράγματα ἐμπεσὼν μετανοεῖν. καὶ ὁ μὲν, ὑποψίᾳ τῇ Ἡρώδου, δέσμιος εἰς τὸν Μαχαιροῦντα πεμφθεὶς — — ταύτῃ κτίννυται· τοῖς δὲ Ἰουδαίοις δόξα, ἐπὶ τιμωρίᾳ τῇ ἐκείνου τὸν ὄλεθρον ἐπὶ τῷ στρατεύματι γενέσθαι, τοῦ θεοῦ κακῶς Ἡρώδῃ θέλοντος.

4 Cf. Recog. Clem. I. 54 and 60. In the middle of the 17th century certain Carmelite missionaries discovered a sect residing in the neighbourhood of Basrah and Susa, calling themselves *Nazoræans*, or *Mendaans*, and called by the Mahometans *Sabians* (Sabæi. The name was taken probably from the Koran), to whom they gave the name of Johannites, or St. John Christians. Cf. *Ignatii a Jesu* narratio originis, rituum, et errorum Christianorum S. Johannis. Rom. 1652. 8vo. One of their books has been published entire (Codex Nazaræus, liber Adami appellatus, Syriace transcriptus latineque redditus a *Math. Norberg*, 3 Th. Lond. 1815–16. 4to.), and fragments of others, besides many accounts of travellers; and in the Universal Encyclopædia of Ersch and Gruber (Probe-Hefte), Gesenius has given a general view of their system (Art. *Zabier*), which he shows to be Gnostic-ascetic, and nearly related to that of Zoroaster, John being represented as an incarnated Æon. — The language of their holy books is an Aramæan dialect, which is about in the middle between Syriac and Chaldaic. — They pretend to have come from the Jordan, and to have been driven thence by the Mahometans. Most scholars admit that they are really the descendants of John's disciples. On the other side, see O. G. Tychsen in Deutschen

§ 23.

PUBLIC LIFE AND MINISTRY OF JESUS.

Jesus also came from Galilee to be baptized in Jordan, where his superior dignity was at once acknowledged by John. This baptism was the consecration to his high calling. He began, indeed, only with the same summons to repentance with which John had appeared (Matth. iv. 17), but soon unfolded a far more comprehensive system, which, though addressed directly to the Jews, was in its nature intended for all mankind. The Jews were at this time most deserving objects of compassion. In the deepest political degradation they cherished the most extravagant hopes, and thus even by their religion were drawn on to their ruin. And yet when freed from the corruptions of a crafty priesthood, and drawn pure from the Scriptures, how must this religion have revealed itself to every heart as coming directly from the Deity, and offering the only true source of human happiness! By precept and example our Saviour strove to revive amongst his countrymen this divine element of the Mosaic religion, to purify and unfold it, and make it a living principle in their hearts. By this spiritual regeneration alone could they be saved from political ruin, which we cannot doubt our Saviour would gladly have done; though this was the least part of his plan.

Jesus appeared first in Galilee, and resided chiefly at Capernaum, from whence he visited the different parts of Galilee, and was often for a long time together in Judea on his way to and from the various festivals. In Samaria we find him only occasionally, on journeys; and once only beyond the precincts of Judea (Mark vii. 24). After some time he drew around him twelve young men, illiterate (Matth. xi. 25), and from the lower orders of society, whom by constant intercourse and instruction he hoped to imbue with his own spirit, and prepare to carry on what he had begun. They accompanied him on his short journeys, in the course of which he attracted universal attention, as well by his extraordinary works, as by his irresistible and convincing eloquence (Matth. vii. 28, 29; Luke iv. 32). At first he avoided observation (Matth. ix. 30), and forbade his disciples to make him known (Matth. xvi. 20); but afterwards he declares himself to be the promised Messiah with a firmness, which forbids the idea of mere accommodation to the expectations of the time (Matth. xxvi. 64). This, however, as well as the other religious ideas of the Old Testament, he conceived in a new and exalted sense, far different from the local and temporary one common amongst his countrymen.[1] The Theocracy was exalted by him into a "*heavenly*

Museum. 1784. Th. 2. S. 414. Baumgarten Crusius bibl. Theol. S. 143. [See *Mosheim* de rebus Christ. ante Const. Magn. p. 43–45, translated in Murdock's Mosheim, note 7, p. 40. Conversations-Lexicon, Art. *Sabier*. Neanders Kirchengeschichte. Bd. 1. Abth. 2. p. 427, note 2. — Tr.]

[1] Chr. F. Böhme die Religion Jesu Christi aus ihren Urkunden dargestellt. Halle. 1825. 8vo.

kingdom," in which mankind, filled with the spirit of God, should be one with him and with each other. This kingdom of God he, as the Messiah, was to found on earth, and to this end he required of his countrymen, sunk as they were in mere ceremonial worship, first *change of heart*, that they might be fitted to receive the spirit of God; and then *faith* in him as the Christ, that by trusting to the guidance of a higher spirit, they might be elevated to unrestrained communion with the Divinity. Of course nothing could more obstruct the accomplishment of such a purpose than the *external righteousness* of the Pharisees, against which therefore his efforts were especially directed. True, he did not abolish the observance of the ritual law of Moses, to which he himself conformed; yet he did not disguise his contempt for mere external ceremonies as such, and without regard to the feeling they were meant to express (Matth. xii. 1 seq.; xv. 1 seq.; v. 24; xii. 9); and it could not be but this must lead in the end to the rejection of the Jewish ceremonial law. In like manner Jesus limited his own personal efforts to his countrymen, and, out of regard to their national prejudices, even avoided all intercourse with foreigners (Matth. x. 5; xv. 21–28); but his doctrines, by laying no stress on external distinctions, evidently tended to do away the distinction between Jew and Gentile, and were addressed to all mankind, as he himself more than once distinctly enough intimated (Matth. viii. 11; xxi. 43).

Whilst Jesus sought thus to lead his disciples to a purer religion, and to a moral union in the kingdom of God, he drew them gradually away from the belief, universal amongst their countrymen, that evil and suffering are always the punishment of sin (Luke xiii. 2 seq.; John ix. 2, 3), promised them forgiveness of sins on condition of repentance and faith, and taught them in this inward communion with God to meet all the trials of life with submission and confidence, and full reliance on his protecting care (Matth. vi. 33; x. 28). The kingdom of God was as yet only within them (Luke xvii. 21), and constantly opposed by the evil in the world; but hereafter, as he promised, he would reappear, to judge the evil, and restore the natural connexion between piety and happiness (Matth. xxiv. 30; xxv. 31). This triumph of the kingdom of God corresponded, though indeed in a very different sense, with the Jewish idea of the kingdom of the Messiah; and as in any case it could be only figuratively described, Jesus naturally availed himself of the figures, to which his countrymen were already accustomed, though at the same time pointing them clearly enough to a more spiritual (Matth. xxii. 30), more universal, and purer view. It was unavoidable that these figures should be differently understood, according to the degree of religious cultivation; but the leading idea, on which every thing depended, the idea that, in the triumphant kingdom of God, piety would ultimately be attended by happiness, could be mistaken by none. The disciples, accustomed to think of the kingdom of the Messiah as an earthly kingdom, understood all these figures in a literal and material sense; and not only so, but went on to supply many things which had never

been distinctly taught.[2] Thus, for instance, from the warning to be always ready (Matth. xxiv. 43, 44), they drew the inference that the coming of Christ was near at hand (Matth. xvi. 27); although Jesus had declared that no one but the Father knew of that hour (Matth. xxiv. 36). These mistaken expectations could not be torn from them without endangering their faith in Jesus as the Messiah; but by a series of events they were gradually purified and spiritualized. And especially the closing scenes of our Saviour's life, though fatal to the false hopes of the Apostles, must have convinced them how different are the ways of God from the expectations of man; whilst they confirmed their faith in their master as the Messiah, and presented the highest example of the sacrifice of all worldly objects, and of unshaken confidence in God.

For the Pharisees, stung with the truth of our Lord's reproaches, rested not in their persecution (as he had long foreseen, Matth. ix. 15; xvi. 21 seq.), till they had brought him to a cruel death. Betrayed into their hands by one of his disciples, on the night of that supper, which was to be the symbol of their inward union with him and one another, he was brought before Pontius Pilate as a mover of sedition, through whose weakness and indecision he was condemned. But after his resurrection the courage of his disciples revived; and so firm was their faith in him, that from this time forward no sufferings or privations could ever shake it. Many of their prejudices, however, still remained, and were only gradually corrected. Thus it was long before they fully understood the last injunction of Jesus, "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name *amongst all nations.*" (Luke xxiv. 47.)

§ 24.

SUPPOSED CONTEMPORARY NOTICES OF JESUS.

The passage, in which Josephus speaks of Jesus (Ant. xviii. 3, 3), is with the greatest probability held to be genuine, though interpolated.[1] On the other hand, the correspondence of Christ with

---

[2] *C. F. Boehme* de spe Messiana Apostolica. Halæ. 1826. 8vo. [See *Nisbett's* Attempt to display the orig. evid. of Christianity in their genuine simplicity. 8vo. Lond. 1807. *Tychsen* de παρουσία Christi. Goett. 1785. pp. xxiii. On the other side, *Bp. Watson's* Apol. for Christianity. Letter III. — Tr.]

[1] Γίνεται δὲ κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον Ἰησοῦς, σοφὸς ἀνήρ, [εἴγε ἄνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν χρή· ἦν γὰρ] παραδόξων ἔργων ποιητής, [διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων τῶν σὺν ἡδονῇ τἀληθῆ δεχομένων]. καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν τῶν Ἰουδαίων, πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ ἐπηγάγετο. [Ὁ Χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν.] Καὶ αὐτὸν ἐνδείξει τῶν πρώτων ἀνδρῶν παρ' ἡμῖν σταυρῷ ἐπιτετιμηκότος Πιλάτου οὐκ ἐξεπαύσαντο οἱ τὸ πρῶτον αὐτὸν ἀγαπήσαντες. [Ἐφάνη γὰρ αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἔχων ἡμέραν πάλιν ζῶν, τῶν θείων προφητῶν ταῦτά τε καὶ ἄλλα μυρία περὶ αὐτοῦ θαυμάσια εἰρηκότων.] Εἰσέτι τε νῦν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀπὸ τούδε ὠνομασμένων οὐκ ἐπέλιπε τὸ φῦλον. — This passage was first cited by Eusebius (hist. eccl. I. 11. Demonstr. evangel. III. 5.), and for a long time adopted by later writers without hesitation. Its genuineness was first called in question by *Hubert Gifanius* (known only by the reply of Sebastianus Lepusculus ad Severinum Ertzbergium dd. Basileæ d. 24 Febr. 1559, in *Meleh.*

Abgarus, Toparch of Edessa,[2] and the two descriptions of the last scenes of our Saviour's life, the *Acta Pilati*, and the *Evangelium Nicodemi*,[3] are beyond all contradiction spurious. Of still more

---

Goldasti centuria epistolarum philologicarum No. 61.), and *Lucas Osiander* (in epitome historiæ ecclesiasticæ Centur. I. lib. 2. cap. 7. Tubing. 1592.) Later investigations on the subject from A. D. 1646–1661: Epistolæ XXX. philol. et hist. de Fl. Jos. testim., quod J. C. tribuit, rec. *Christoph. Arnold.* Noriberg. 1661. 12mo. (reprinted in Havercamp's edition of Josephus, Tom. II. App. p. 233.) Amongst these the best are by *Dav. Blondel* and *Tanaquil Faber* against the genuineness. — Still later it has been defended by *Carol. Daubuz* pro testimonio Flavii Josephi de Jesu Christo libb. II. Londini. 1706. 8vo. (reprinted in Havercamp's Josephus, Tom. II. App. p. 187.) — Houteville erwiesene Wahrheit der christlichen Religion durch ihre Geschichte. Frankf. 1745. 4to. S. 275–311. — Oberthür in der Vorrede zum 2ten Theile der Uebersetzung des Josephus von Friese. Altona. 1805. — *C. G. Bretschneider* πάρεργον super Jos. de J. C. testimonio (affixed to his capit. theolog. Jud. dogm. e Fl. Josephi scriptis collect. Lips. 1812. 8vo. pag. 59.) — C. F. Böhmert über des Flav. Joseph. Zeugniss von Christo. Leipz. 1823. 8vo. (comp. the answer in Miners und Engelhardts theolog. Journ. Bd. 2. S. 95 ff.) — And attacked by *Abbé de Longuerue* sur le passage de Joseph en faveur de Jésus Christ (in answer to Daubuz) in *Clericus* biblioth. ancienne et moderne. T. VII. p. 237. — *God. Lesii* dissertt. II. super Josephi de Christo testimonio. Goetting. 1781–82. — *Eichstaedt* Flaviani de J. C. testimonii αὐθεντία quo jure nuper defensa sit, quæstt. III. Jenæ. 1813–14. — Grounds for the genuineness: 1. The agreement of all the MSS. since the time of Eusebius: 2. The number of the Christians was too great to have been entirely passed over by Josephus: 3. Josephus not only mentions John the Baptist, but also the death of James, τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ (Ant. XX. 9, 1). Against it: 1. The silence of all the Church fathers before Eusebius, whilst Josephus is designated by Orig. c. Cels. I. p. 35, as ἀπιστῶν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ὡς Χριστῷ: 2. The passage interrupts the connexion: 3. It reads as if it were written by a Christian: 4. Neither did the other Jewish historian, Justus Tiberiensis, mention Jesus, Photii. bibl. cod. 33. — The most probable supposition is, that the passage is interpolated from Eusebius, which might easily happen, as Josephus was copied and read only by Christians. As to the manner in which it was interpolated, there is a variety of opinions. *Knittel* (nova biblioth. phil. et crit. Vol. I. fasc. 1. Goettin. 1782. 8vo. p. 118 seq.) and *Paulus* (Heidelb. Jahrb. August, 1820) suppose that certain expressions have been altered: *Steph. le Moyne* Varia Sacra. T. II. p. 931, *l'Abbé des Fontaines* (in the Journal des Savans ann. 1723), *Paulus* Comm. über die 3 ersten Evang. Th. 3. S. 740, *Olshausen* hist. eccl. vet. monumenta præcipua, vol. I. Berol. 1820. p. 3, *Heinichen* Excurs. in his ed. of Eusebius, suppose that glosses have been inserted. My own view of the subject is explained by the words enclosed in parentheses in the passage above. [See Lardner's Coll. ch. IV. — Tr.]

[2] Euseb. hist. eccl. I. 13, pretends to have found these letters in the church at Edessa, and to have translated them from the Syriac. In the time of Christ, Abgarus Uchomo — about A. D. 170, there was a Christian of that name. Thus these letters may have been the productions of a time earlier than Eusebius. Cf. *Assemanni* bibl. Orient. T. I. p. 554. T. III. P. II. p. 8. *Bayer* historia Edessena et Osrhoëna. Petrop. 1734. 4to. p. 109. *Semler* de Christi ad Abgarum epistola. Hal. 1768. 4to.

[3] Justin Martyr, Apol. I. p. 76, 84, refers to τὰ ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου γενόμενα ἄκτα in the same way in which Chrysostom (hom. 31, de natali Christi) refers to the Acta concerning the census of Quirinus; not that he had himself seen them, but presupposing their existence in the Roman archives. Tertullian, Apolog. c. 5, 21, gives some fabulous accounts of the reports made by Pilate to the emperor. During the persecution under Maximin, the Heathen first brought forward certain calumnious Acta Pilati (Euseb. h. e. IX. c. 5.), to which the Christians opposed others (Epiphan. hær. L. c. I.), which were afterwards in various ways emended. One of these improved versions was called

modern origin are the pretended *likenesses* of Jesus,[4] and the

afterwards the *gospel of Nicodemus;* cf. *Henke* de Pilati actis probabilia. Helmst. 1784. *W. L. Brunn* de indole, ætate, et usu libri apocr. vulgo inscripti Evangel. Nicodemi. Berol. 1794. 8vo. — Editions: J. A. Fabricii codex Apocryphus N. T. Partes III. ed. 2. Hamb. 1719. 8vo. And. Birch auctarium codicis Apocryphi N. T. Fabriciani fasc. I. Hafn. 1804. 4to.

4 The earliest traces of such likenesses are found amongst the Carpocratians (Iren. 1, 25), and in the lararium of Alex. Severus (Lamprid. c. 29.). During the persecutions of the earlier periods, the church had need of a model of endurance under evils, and hence they loved to think of their Lord as one "without form or loveliness, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief" — according to Isaiah liii. 2, 3. (Thus Tertull. de carne Christi 9, adv. Jud. c. 14., et passim. Clem. Alex. Pædag. III. 1., Strom. II. p. 368. Orig. contra Cels. VI. p. 327. δυσειδὲς τὸ Ἰησοῦ σῶμα.) At the same time all representations of him were strictly forbidden in conformity to Exod. xx. 4. But as soon as the arts were employed to embody the idea of the Saviour in visible images, it was natural that the form should partake of the nobleness of the being it represented. Hence from the 4th century Jesus was supposed to have had a body of extraordinary beauty, full "of glory and majesty," according to Ps. xlv. 3. (Hieronym. comm. in Matth. ix. 9.) Still they confessed there was no authentic likeness of the Saviour (Augustin. de trinitate VIII. 4. Nam et ipsius dominicæ facies carnis innumerabilium cogitationum diversitate variatur et fingitur, quæ tamen una erat quæcunque erat; and (c. 5), Qua fuerit ilite facie, nos penitus ignoramus.) Eusebius (h. e. VII. c. 18) speaks of a statue in Paneas, which was supposed to represent the occurrence related Matth. ix. 20. Others repeat the same story on his authority, and John Malala (as late as A. D. 600) even gives the name of the woman Βερονίκη; though there could hardly have been any copy of the monument referred to by Eusebius, since it was destroyed by Julian. (Sozom. V. 21. Philostorg. VII. 3.) From various coins the conclusion has been drawn that the monument was erected in honor of some emperor (probably Hadrian), and perhaps appropriated by Christians on account of the word σωτηρι or θεῳ occurring in the inscription (cf. Th. Hasæi diss. II. de monimento Paneadensi. Bremæ. 1726. 4to., and in his Sylloge Dissertt. P. II. p. 314 seq. Beausobre's Treatise on the statue at Paneas in Cramer's Sammlungen zur Kirchengesch. und theol. Gelehrsamk. Th. 1. Leipz. 1748.) — *More modern images of Christ (imagines Christi non manu factæ.* cf. *J. Gretser* syntagma de imagg. non manu factis. Ingolst. 1622, and append. to Georg. Codinus, ed. J. Goar. p. 289. *Is. Beausobre* des images de main divine) are, (1.) That sent to Abgarus Θεόπτευκτος εἰκὼν, ἣν ἀνθρώπων χεῖρες οὐκ εἰργάσαντο (*Evagrius* hist. eccl. IV. 26), and often referred to in the picture controversy. It was originally brought to Constantinople from Edessa. Rome and Genoa now contend for the honor of its possession. A new miraculous copy of it was brought by order of the emperor Nicephorus from Edessa A. D. 968. Cf. Leo Diaconus, lib. IV. c. 10. (2.) Sudarium St. Veronicæ, in the middle ages called (properly) Veronica, i. e. *vera icon.* cf. *Gervasii Tiberiensis* (about A. D. 1210) otia imperialia c. 25, (Leibn. scriptt. Brunsv. T. I. p. 968): De figurâ Domini, quæ Veronica dicitur. — Est ergo Veronica pictura Domini vera. *Matth. Paris.* ad ann. 1216. effigies vultûs Domini, quæ Veronica dicitur. It is now in Jaen, Milan, and Rome. (cf. *Acta SS.* ad d. 4 Feb. *Lambertini* de Servorum Dei beatificatione. Lib. IV. P. II. c. 31.) John VII. (A. D. 705) is said to have erected a church *S. Mariæ in Beronica.* (3.) Sudarium Christi (first mentioned by Beda in Lib. de locis sanctis) in Besançon, and the Sindon Christi in Turin. — *Pretended pictures of Christ, by his contemporaries.* These are, (1.) A picture painted by Luke; mentioned first perhaps by *Theodorus lector* (about A. D. 518) in *Nicephorus Callistus* (about A. D. 1333) hist. eccl. II. 43, who mentions also pictures of Mary and the principal apostles, *Gregory III.* in his epist. ad Leonem imp., *Simeon Metaphrastes* (about A. D. 900) in vita S. Lucæ. There is a picture of Jesus as a boy of thirteen in the Sancta Sanctorum attached to the church of St. John Lateran at Rome. (2.) A picture of Christ carved in cedar by Nicodemus, which it is pretended was formerly at Berytus (cf. [*Pseudo-*] *Athanasius* de passione

letter of Lentulus to the Roman Senate, with a description of his person.[5]

CHAPTER SECOND.

APOSTOLIC AGE, TO THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.

SOURCES: Acts of the Apostles,[1] and the Epistles of the New Testament.— Scattered notices in the Fathers of the first period collected by Eusebius.[2]

WORKS: *Lud. Capelli* historia Apostolica illustrata. Genev. 1634. 4to.— *Wm. Cave's* Hist. of the Apostles. Lond. 1677.— *Ph. Jac. Hartmann* Comm. de rebus gestis Christianorum sub Apostolis. Berol. 1699. 4to.— *J. F. Buddei* eccl. Apostolica. Jenæ. 1799. 8vo.— *G. Benson's* First Planting of the Christian Religion. 3 vols. in 1. 4to. Lond. 1756.— J. J. Hess Geschichte und Schriften der Apostel Jesu. 3 Bde. 4to. ed. 1822.— *F. Lücke* Comm. de eccl. Christ. Apostolica. Gött. 1813. 4to.— Planck's Gesch. d. Christenthums etc. See before § 20.— G. C. R. Matthäi der Religionsglaube der Apostel nach seinem Inhalte, Ursprunge u. Werthe. Bd. I. Gött. 1826.

§ 25.

EARLY HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIANS TO THE CONVERSION OF PAUL.

After the ascension of Jesus, his followers, more than 500 in number (1 Cor. xv. 6), and amongst them the twelve disciples, *Simon*

---

imaginis D. n. J. Ch. qualiter crucifixa est, in Syria in urbe Beryto). This is mentioned first in the Actis Synod. Nicænæ II. (787) sess. IV., was brought to Constantinople by the emperor Nicephorus (Leo Diac. X. c. 5.), and is now in Lucca (vultus Lucanus, see *Gervasius*, c. 24, in *Leibn.* Scriptt. Brunsv. T. I. p. 967.— Cf. *Joh. Reiskii* exercitatt. hist. de imaginibus J. Ch. Jenæ. 1685. 4to. *Jablonski* de origine imaginum Christi in opuscul. ed. *te Water*. T. III. p. 377. (Lugd. Batav. 1809.) F. Muenter Sinnbilder und Kunstvorstellungen der alten Christen. (2 Hefte. Altona. 1825. 4to.)

5 (*J. B. Carpzov*) De oris et corporis Jesus Christi forma Pseudolentuli, Joh. Damasceni et Nicephori prosopographiæ. Helmst. 1777. 4to.— In αὐθεντίαν epistolæ P. Lentuli ad Sen. Rom. de Jesu Chr. scriptæ denuo inquirit *J. Ph. Gabler*. Jen. 1819. (Pfingstprogr.)— [Vid. Bibl. Repository. Andover. April, 1832.— Tr.]

1 See *Fabricii* Cod. Apocr. Nov. Test. Tom. II. p. 743 seq. for an account of the numerous apocryphal Acts of the Apostles. These are found chiefly amongst the heretics. Thus amongst the Ebionites the περίοδοι Πέτρου διὰ Κλήμεντος γραφεῖσαι (Epiph. hær. XXX. c. 15. comp. § 41, not. 5), and πράξεις ἄλλαι Ἀποστόλων (l. c. c. 16.): amongst the Manichæans the Actus Apostolorum, or τῶν Ἀποστόλων περίοδοι, written by a certain Lucius Charinus (Augustin. de fide contra Manich. c. 38. Photii Bibl. cod. 114) etc. One of the most modern productions of this kind is *Abdiæ* (a pretended pupil of the Apostles, and first bishop of Babylon) historia certaminis Apostolici, (written in the 9th or 10th century), Latin, in Fabricii Cod. Apocryph. Nov. Test. T. II. p. 388 seq.— On this subject see *Thilo* Acta Thomæ in the notitia on p. lii. seq.

2 More modern are: Synopsis de vita et morte Prophetarum, Apostolorum, et

(Cephas, Petrus) and *Andrew*, the sons of Jonas, *James* and *John*, the sons of Zebedee (Boanerges, Mark iii. 17), *Philip*, *Thomas* (called Didymus, John xx. 24), *Bartholomew* (Nathaniel? John i. 46), *Matthew* (Levi, the son of Alpheus, Mark ii. 14, comp. Matth. ix. 9), *James* and *Jude* (Lebbeus, whose surname was Thaddeus, Matth. x. 3), sons of Alpheus (Cleopas, John xix. 25) and Mary, the brethren of the Lord (Gal. i. 19[1]), *Simon*, the Canaanite (Matth. x. 47), and *Matthias*, who was chosen in place of Judas Iscariot, remained in seclusion at Jerusalem until the day of Pentecost, when the divine spirit began to manifest itself in them in an extraordinary manner. Filled with strength and courage the Apostles now appeared more publicly, and every day saw new accessions to the number of their converts. Still, however, they by no means abandoned the Jewish law, but rather considered themselves as the true Israelites (*μαθηταί, ἀδελφοί, πιστεύοντες, σωζόμενοι, φοβούμενοι τὸν Θεόν*, called in derision Galileans and Nazarenes by the Jews), who, saved from this corrupt generation (Acts ii. 40), were preparing themselves for the coming of the Messiah's kingdom: though it must be confessed that their notions of this kingdom were earthly, and that they seem to have been looking for it in their own time (Acts i. 6; iii. 19–21).[2] The conditions of admittance into their number were repentance and faith in Christ, and on these terms was promised forgiveness of sins, and the holy spirit imparted by the laying on of hands. Though the Apostles knew that the Heathen also were to be invited to take part in the kingdom of God, it was believed necessary for them first to subscribe to the whole Jewish law as *proselyti justitiæ;* and this of course retarded their conversion.

But though the Christians did not separate themselves from the Jews, they were drawn towards each other by a common faith and peculiar hopes, and thus by degrees they became a regularly constituted society. The model of this society was very naturally the Jewish synagogue.[3] Its affairs were at first administered by the Apostles, but afterwards especial officers were appointed for the various duties. As the distribution of alms to the poor, for instance, was an office of considerable labor, and threatened to impair the usefulness of the Apostles in their proper sphere of instruction,[4] they

---

LXX discipulorum Christi, spuriously ascribed to *Dorotheus Tyrius*, about A. D. 303, (Latin, in Bibl. PP. max. Tom. III., Greek Fragments in *Cave* histor. literar. T. I. p. 164 seq. and in the Chronicon Paschale, ed. du Fresne, p. 426 seq.) — *Hippolytus* (not Portuensis about 230, perhaps Thebanus about 930) de XII Apostolis, ubinam quisque eorum prædicaverit, et consummatus sit (in *Combefisii* Auctario, T. II. Paris. 1648.)

1 Cf. *D. J. Pott* prolegomena in epist. Jacobi (ed. III. 1816). pag. 58–90.

2 *C. F. Bochme* de spe Messiana Apostolica. Halæ. 1826. 8vo. [Vid. *Nisbett's* Attempt to display the Evidences of Christianity in their genuine simplicity. 8vo. Lond. 1807. *Tychsen* de *παρουσία* Christi. Gött. 1785. pp. xxiii. — Tr.]

3 Chief work on this subject: — *Campeg. Vitringa* de Synagoga vetere libb. III, quibus tum de Synagogis agitur, tum præcipue formam regiminis et ministerii earum in Ecclesiam christ. translatam esse demonstratur. Franequeræ. 1696. and Leucopetr. 1726. 4to.

4 The expectation of the immediate coming of the Messiah no doubt con-

caused seven young men to be chosen for the discharge of this duty (Acts vi. 1 – 6).[5] Soon after we find *Presbyters* also in the church (Acts xi. 30), whose office seems to have been not so much to teach, as to manage the affairs of the community and enforce its rules. In all these appointments the Apostles did not act on their authority alone, but allowed all to have a voice (Acts vi. 2; xv. 22, 23).

The boldness of the Apostles, and their great success, soon attracted attention. Their most bitter enemies were the Sadducees, to whom the doctrine of one risen from the dead was of course a stumbling-block (Acts iv. 2; v. 17; xxiii. 6); whilst many of the Priests (Acts vi. 7) and of the Pharisees (Acts xv. 5) became converts to the faith. Having in vain attempted to intimidate them by threats (Acts iv.), the Sadducees took counsel to slay them (Acts v. 17), but were withheld by the advice of Gamaliel (Acts v. 34, comp. xxiii. 6). In the mean time certain Hellenistic Jews, provoked by the zeal of Stephen, stirred up the people against him. The Sanhedrim did not long resist the popular tumult, and Stephen died the first martyr (Acts vi. 8 – vii. 60). With this commenced a persecution of the Christians, which in the end led to the wider dissemination of their faith. Driven from Jerusalem they preached the gospel in Judea, Samaria (Acts viii. 1 - 4), and even as far as Damascus (Acts ix. 10, 19), Phœnicia, Cyprus, and Antioch, though still only to the Jews (Acts xi. 19). In the mean time they had laid aside the Pharasaical prejudice against the Samaritans, and Philip met with great success amongst that people. He also preached on the seacoast of Palestine, and at last took up his residence in Cæsarea, where he probably founded a church (Acts viii. 40; comp. xxi. 8). After this Peter and John were sent into Samaria by the Apostles, who had till now remained in Jerusalem (Acts viii. 14 seq.). Peter went then to the cities on the seacoast, and whilst in Cæsarea was commissioned to baptize Cornelius, a Roman centurion, and probably a "proselyte of the gate" (Acts x.). For this he was taken to task by the brethren at Jerusalem, but succeeded in pacifying them (Acts xi. 1 – 18); still for the

---

tributed to produce this great liberality to the poor (comp. Matt. xxv. 34 seq.). Acts ii. 44, 45; iv. 33 – 35, refer probably not to a community of goods, but a voluntary partition according to the injunction, Luke xii. 33. Cf. *Mosheim* de vera natura communionis bonorum in ecclesia Hierosolymitana comm. (*ejusd.* dissertt. ad hist. eccles. pertinentium, vol. II. p. 1.) — The crime of Ananias (Acts v.) was meanness accompanied by the pretence of holy enthusiasm.

5 Luke distinguishes them only as "the seven," Acts xxi. 8. In later times they have been considered as the first *Deacons;* and this as early as Cyprian, epist. 65. ad Rogatianum. — *Vitringa,* on the other hand (de syn. vet. lib. III. P. II. cap. 5), classes them with the גַּבָּאִים of the Synagogue, the διακόνους of Paul with the חַזָּנִים. Afterwards, however, their duties were extended; see *Mosheim* de rebus Christ. ante Const. M. p. 120. Another suggestion of Vitringa l. c., supported by Mosheim l. c. S. 118., is that those seven were appointed to the care of the Hellenists exclusively. But this does not follow from the mere circumstance that their names are Greek, as in the instance of the apostles Andrew and Philip. — Perhaps there were three Hebrews, three Hellenistic Jews, and a proselyte.

most part they could be brought no further than to allow that baptism might *precede* circumcision. It was only with this understanding that the church at Jerusalem approved of the conduct of certain Hellenistic Jews in converting the Heathen at Antioch (Acts xi. 20; comp. verse 22). Amongst the Jews, it is true, there had always been some, who differed from the strict doctrine of the Pharisees, that all nations were bound to observe the Mosaic law, and considered it sufficient that foreigners should become "*proselytes of the gate.*"[6] But amongst the Christians the more strict view was universal, not only from the influence of the Pharisee converts (Acts xv. 5), but because the universal observance of the Mosaic law was supposed to be one of the essential characteristics of the time of the Messiah (according to Isaiah lii. 1; lxvi. 17, 20; Zach. viii. 20 – 23; xiv. 16 seq.)

§ 26.

PAUL.

Paley's Horæ Paulinæ. Translated from the English by H. Ph. C. Henke. Helmstadt. 1797. 8vo.

In the mean time, however, that man had become a convert to Christianity, to whom the "*mystery*" of the calling of the Gentiles was to be made known (Eph. iii. 3 – 6). Saul of Tarsus, a native of Cilicia, but educated in Jerusalem at the feet of Gamaliel, and a Pharisee, from the bitterest foe of Christianity suddenly became its most zealous defender (A. D. 37 – 40.)[1] After three years' residence in Damascus and Arabia he came to Jerusalem, where he was introduced to the Apostles Peter and James by Barnabas (Gal. i. 17 – 19; Acts ix. 19 – 27), and the same friend afterwards led him to the great scene of his Apostolic labors. For, having been sent by the Apostles to the young church at Antioch, to strengthen them in the faith, Barnabas went to Tarsus for Paul (Acts xi. 22 – 26); and such was their activity and success, that whilst the mother-church at Jerusalem

---

6 Joseph. Ant. XX. 2. See Gieseler's Abhandlung von den Nazaräern und Ebioniten (in Stäudlins und Tzschirners Archiv für Kirchengeschichte, Bd. 4. St. 2.) S. 308 ff.

1 For the Chronology, vid. *Jo. Pearson* Annales Paulini (prefixed to his Opp. posthuma chronologica. Lond. 1688. 4to. — Süskind Versuch chronologischer Standpunkte für die Apostelgeschichte (in Bengels Archiv für die Theologie. Bd. 1. St. 2, S. 303). — Vogel Versuch chronologischer Standpunkte in der Lebensgeschichte Pauli (in Gablers theol. Journ. Bd. 1. St. 2. S. 243). — *Keil* de definiendo tempore itineris Pauli Hierosolymitani Gal. ii. 1, 2, commemorati. 1798. (rec. in *Potti* sylloge commentatt. theolog. vol. III. p. 68 seq., and in *Keilii* opuscul. academ. ed. J. D. Goldhorn, P. I. p. 160.) — J. E. C. Schmidt Chronologie der Apostelgeschichte (in Keil and Tzschirners Analecten für das Stud. der exeget. und system. Theologie. Bd. 3, St. 1, S. 128). On the other hand, see Keil über die Zeit, in welcher der Brief an die Galater geschrieben ist (Analecten etc. Bd. 3. St. 2. S. 55, and, Latin, in *Keilii* opusculis P. I. p. 351.) *C. G. Kuechler* de anno quo Paulus Apost. ad sacra Christ. conversus est. Lips. 1828. 8vo.

was suffering under the persecution of Herod Agrippa (A. D. 41–44), who hoped by this means to conciliate the people, — James the elder having been put to death, and Peter escaping the same fate only by a miracle (Acts xii.), — the church at Antioch * became so rich and strong as to be able to send them assistance in a time of famine (Acts xi. 27–30; xii. 25), by the hands of Paul and Barnabas. After this, these two Apostles entered on their first great journey through Cyprus, Pamphylia, Pisidia, and Lycaonia, preaching the gospel alike to Jew and Gentile. After their return to Antioch there came thither certain men from Judea, who created much dissension by maintaining that the Gentile converts must submit to circumcision as "*proselytes of righteousness*" (proselyti justitiæ). To put an end to this dispute, Paul and Barnabas were sent to Jerusalem; where, in a general assembly of the Apostles and elders, it was decided, at the instance of Peter and James, that only those things should be required of the Gentile converts, which had always been required of the Jewish "*proselytes of the gate*," [2] (Acts xv.) A. D. 52. Soon after this, Barnabas and Mark went again to Cyprus, whilst Paul and Silas visited the churches of Asia Minor. In Lystra, Paul took with him Timothy, and, passing through Phrygia and Galatia, crossed over to Macedonia,

---

* Χριστιανοί (Acts xi. 26). The name of *Christians* was probably first used in derision by the inhabitants of Antioch, who were noted for their witticisms (Lucian de saltat. c. 76. Julianus Misopog. p. 344. Ammian. Marcell. XXII. 14. Zosimus, IV. p. 258. Procop. Pers. II. 8.)

2 The injunctions, Acts xv. 29, are the same which the proselytes of the gate had to observe. Thus *Origen* in comment. ad epist. ad Rom. lib. II. (ad Rom. ii. 26. ed. Wirceb. p. 83): Vides ergo (namely, from the passage, Levit. xvii. 10–12) hanc de observatione sanguinis legem, quæ communiter et filiis Israel et advenis data est, observari etiam a nobis, qui ex gentibus per Jesum Christum credimus Deo. Nos enim proselytos et advenas Scriptura nominare consuevit: cum dicit (Deut. xxviii. 43): *Advena, qui est in te, ascendet super te sursum; tu autem descendes deorsum. Ipse erit tibi caput, tu autem eris ejus cauda.* Ideo ergo legem de observatione sanguinis communem cum filiis Israel etiam gentium suscepit ecclesia. Hæc namque ita intelligens in lege scripta, tunc beatum illud Apostolorum concilium decernebat: dogmata et decreta gentibus scribens, ut abstinerent se non solum ab his, quæ idolis immolantur, et a fornicatione, sed a sanguine et a suffocato. Verum fortasse requires, si, ut de sanguinis observantia claruit, ita etiam de suffocato doceatur, utrum communis filiis Israel cum advenis data sit lex, quia etiam de hoc observare gentes Apostolorum statuta decernunt. Audi, quam observanter etiam super hoc in Dei legibus cautum sit; (Levit. xvii. 13, is here cited,) &c. &c. — *Tertull.* de monogam. c. 5: In Christo omnia revocantur ad initium, — — — et libertas ciborum et sanguinis solius abstinentia, sicut ab initio fuit. — — — Initium tibi et in Adam censetur, et in Noë recensetur. — *Constitt. Apost.* VI. 12, says of those prohibitions: ἄπιε καὶ τοῖς πάλαι νενομοθέτητο τοῖς πρὸ τοῦ νόμου φυσικοῖς Ἑνῶς, Ἑνὼχ, Νῶε, κ. τ. λ. — Vid. Gieselers Abhandl. von den Nazaräern und Ebioniten in Stäudlins und Tzschirners Archiv für Kirchengesch. Bd. 4. St. 2. S. 309–312. So also *W. Schickard* de jure regio Ebræorum (Argentor. 1625) cap. 5. p. 129. *Hammond* and *Alex. Morus* ad Act. xv. 20. *Sandius* in nucleo hist. eccl. p. 54. On the other side, *Spencer* de legibus Hebr. ritualibus ed. Pfaff. p. 595 ff. Comp. *Nitzsch* de sensu decreti Apostolici, Act. xv. 29. Viteb. 1795 (in commentatt. theol. ed. *a Velthusen, Ruperti, et Kuinoel*, vol. VI. p. 403). *Nösselt.* diss. de vera vi et ratione decreti Hierosolymitani, Act. xv. (in *ejusd.* exercitatt. ad sacr. script. interpret. p. 95.)

where churches had been founded at Philippi, Thessalonica, and Berea, and came by the way of Athens to Corinth (Epistles to the Thessalonians).[3] Here he stayed about a year and a half, and then returned to Antioch by the way of Ephesus, Cæsarea, and Jerusalem (Acts xv. 36 — xviii. 22). His stay at Antioch, however, was very short. He then entered on his third great journey to Asia Minor. The first two years and a half he passed at Ephesus, confirming the churches in this city and its vicinity (Gal.; 1 Cor.): then he went through Macedonia (1 Tim.; 2 Cor.) to Corinth (vid. Romans), and after a stay of three months in that city returned to Jerusalem by way of Miletus (Acts xviii. 23 — xxi. 17). Here he was taken prisoner in the temple, brought to Cæsarea, and, after having been there two years a prisoner, carried to Rome (A. D. 60). (Vid. Eph., Philipp., Coloss., and Philemon.) With this the book of the Acts of the Apostles closes. According to later, though still very ancient, testimonies, Paul was freed from this imprisonment and took several journeys (vid. Titus, and 1 Tim.),* but was again imprisoned at Rome (2 Tim.) until his death (A. D. 67).[4] — The most distinguished of his pupils were *Timothy*, who was a long time at Ephesus, by Paul's commission, to arrange the affairs of the church; *Titus*, who was left at Crete for the same purpose (both afterwards considered as the first bishops of these churches, Euseb. III. 4); and *Luke*.

Paul and his school are distinguished from the Christians of Palestine by a more free and spiritual view of Christianity.[5] For though these last had excused the Gentile converts from the strict observance of the Mosaic law, they perseveringly required it from their own countrymen. But Paul, who saw already that a spiritual union with God through faith in Jesus Christ was alone essential, taught both by precept (Rom. vii. 1 – 6) and example (1 Cor. ix. 20, 21), that the strict observance of the letter of the law was no longer

---

3 Gallio's treatment of Paul, Acts xviii. 2, led to the fiction of a correspondence between his brother, the philosopher Seneca, and the Apostle. Hieron. Catal. c. 12. Fabric. cod. apocr. N. T. T. II. p. 880 seq. Cf. *Gelpke* tract. de familiaritate, quæ Paulo Apost. cum Seneca philosopho intercessisse traditur, verisimillima. Lips. 1813.

* So Heydenreich die Pastoralbriefe Pauli. Bd. 1. (Hadamar. 1826.) S. 36 ff. — following Usher, Mill, Pearson, Clericus, and Paley. G. Böhl über d. Zeit der Abfassung und d. Paulin. Charakter der Briefe a. Tim. und Titus. Berlin. 1829. S. 204 ff.

4 So Eusebius, h. e. II. c. 22. *P. E. Jablonski* diss. de ultimis Pauli Apost. laboribus a Luca prætermissis (in *ejusd.* Opuscul. ed. *J. G. te Water*. tom. III. p. 289). *J. P. Mynster* de ultimis annis muneris Apostolici a Paulo gesti disquis. (in his Kleinen theolog. Schriften. Kopenhagen. 1825. 8vo. S. 189 ff.) — *Schmidt* and *Eichhorn*, in their Introd. to the N. T.; *E. F. Wolf* de alterâ Pauli Apost. captivitate diss. II. Lips. 1819 - 20; and after them many others, have denied that Paul was imprisoned a second time. See, on the other side, Heydenreich and Böhl, as cited in the foregoing note.

5 G. W. Meyer Entwickelung des Paulinischen Lehrbegriffs. Altona. 1801. 8vo. — (J. G. F. Leun) Reine Auffassung des Urchristenthums in den Paulin. Briefen. Leipz. 1803. 8vo. — L. Usteri Entwickelung des Paulin. Lehrbegriffs. Zürich. 1824. 8vo.

necessary even for the Jewish converts.[6] At the same time he honored the law as the preparation for Christianity (Gal. iii. 24), and observed its prescriptions when amongst his countrymen; openly reproving in Peter a kind of dissimulation, which he feared might offend or perplex the Heathen converts (Gal. ii. 11 – 16). Equally at variance with the spiritual character of Paul's views was the *Chiliasm* of the Christians of Palestine; and though even he supposed the second appearance of Christ to be near at hand (Phil. iv. 5), the triumph of the kingdom of God was not to be an earthly triumph (1 Thess. iv. 16; 2 Cor. v. 1, 2). Our Saviour, too, was represented by Paul, who had seen him only in the clouds of heaven, more in his spiritual and divine character; whilst the other Apostles, who had enjoyed his personal intercourse, naturally dwelt more on the human form, with which they had been familiar. But so little was Christianity at that time a subject of subtile speculation, that these differing opinions could subsist together without difficulty. It was only his liberality on the subject of the observance of the Mosaic law, for which the Jewish Christians found fault with Paul, and the more because all the other Apostles conformed themselves to the more rigid view (Acts xxi. 20).

§ 27.

HISTORY OF THE OTHER APOSTLES, AND THEIR IMMEDIATE FOLLOWERS.

The history of the other Apostles and their early pupils is involved in great obscurity, and often distorted by fiction and mistake. Hence the traditions, that when the Apostles left Jerusalem they determined by lot to what countries they should go,[1] that they together composed the Apostles' creed,[2] and that they were all unmarried;[3] also that all

---

6 Paul affirms (1 Cor. viii. 10, 14 – 33) that not even the laws given to the Heathen concerning the meat offered to idols are absolutely binding.

1 Found first in *Rufinus* in hist. eccl. I. 9. cf. *Act. SS.* ad d. 15 Jul. *Thilo* Acta Thomæ, p. 87 seq.

2 So first *Rufinus* in exposit. Symboli Apostolici. More particularly described in the spurious Homilia de Symbolo of Augustine. cf. *Fabricii* cod. apocr. N. T. vol. III. p. 339 seq. Defended by *Natalis Alex.* hist. eccl. sæc. 1, diss. XII.; *Acta SS.* ad d. 15 Jul. and *J. Chrys. Trombellius* tract. de Sacramentis. Bonon. 1770. T. II. diss. 4, qu. 3. — On the other hand, *Du Pin* and *Tillemont* and all Protestant theologians acknowledge the fiction.

3 This last tradition is too plainly contradicted by 1 Cor. ix. 5, to have originated till long after the time of the Apostles. Hence *Ignatius* ad Philadelph. c. 4, says of Peter and Paul: καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀποστόλων τοῖς γάμοις προσομιλησάντων. *Clem. Alex.* Strom. III. p. 448: Πέτρος καὶ Φίλιππος ἐπαιδοποιήσαντο· καὶ Παῦλος οὐκ ὀκνεῖ ἔν τινι ἐπιστολῇ τὴν αὐτοῦ προσαγορεύειν σύζυλον, ἣν οὐ περιεκόμιζεν διὰ τὸ τῆς ὑπηρεσίας εὐσταλές. Id. Strom. VII. pag. 736, that the wife of Peter suffered martyrdom shortly before him. Tertull. first, de monogam. c. 8, says: Petrum solum invenio maritum; — cæteros cum maritos non invenio, aut spadones intelligam necesse est aut continentes. Nec enim — — Paulum sic interpretabimur, quasi demonstret uxores Apostolos habuisse. In later times, 1 Cor. ix. 5 was explained as referring to female friends, who ministered to the Apostles: *Am-*

of them, excepting John, suffered martyrdom.[4] Here may be enumerated also the custom of considering every Apostle, who had been for a long time in any particular church, as the first bishop of that church.

Peter was still in Jerusalem as late as the year 52 (Acts xv.); then in Antioch (Gal. ii. 11), also in Babylon (1 Peter v. 13); and, according to various ancient testimonies, was put to death at Rome (A. D. 67).[5] That he resided there twenty-five years as bishop, having been previously bishop of Antioch, is first related by Jerome; which tradition has since been much improved and embellished by the ingenuity of papal ambition.[6] *James*, the Younger, remained constantly in Jerusalem, presiding over the church there[7] till his martyrdom, A. D. 62.[8] He was afterwards called the first bishop of Jerusalem.

---

brosiaster ad h. l. *Hieronymus* ad Matth. xxvii. 55. *Theodoret.* ad 1 Cor. ix. 5, who adds, however: τινὲς οὕτως ἠρμήνευσαν. (cf. *Suiceri* thesaur. ecclesiasticus ed. II. Amstel. 1728. T. I. p. 810 s. v. γυνή.) And even when it was conceded, as for instance by *Ambrosiaster* ad 2 Cor. xi. 2: Omnes Apostoli, exceptis Johanne et Paulo, uxores habuerunt; the notion was still retained, *Hieron.* Epist. 30, (al. 50) ad Pammachium (ed. Martianay, T. IV. P. II. p. 242): Apostoli vel virgines, vel post nuptias continentes. On this whole subject vid. *G. Calixtus* de conjugio Clericorum (ed. II. ed. *H. Ph. C. Henke.* Helmst. 1783.) P. II. p. 147 seq.

4 *Heracleon* (ap. *Clem. Alex.* Strom. IV. p. 502), showing that Matthew, Philip, Thomas, and Levi (Thaddeus ?) did not suffer martyrdom.

5 The oldest authorities: *Ignatius* in epist. ad Romanos. *Dionysius Corinth.* (ap. Euseb. II, 25). *Irenæus*, adv. hær. III. 1, 3. Several Protestants have been led by party feeling (especially *Frid. Spanheim* de ficta profectione Petri Apostoli in urbem Romam, in his Opp. T. II. p. 331 ff.) on the authority of an enemy of the Popes in the Middle Ages, *Marsilius Patavinus*, *Michael Cæsenas* etc. (cf. *Spanheim* l. c. p. 337,) to deny that Peter was ever in Rome. Comp. Drey, Herbst und Hirscher theol. Quartalschrift. Tübingen. 1820. 4tes Heft. S. 567. Mynster über den ersten Aufenthalt des Apost. Petr. in Rom, in his Kleinen theolog. Schriften. Kopenh. 1825. S. 141 ff. — On the manner of his death, vid. *Tertull.* de præscr. hær. c. 36: Petrus passioni dominicæ adæquatur, Paulus Johannis exitu coronatur. On the other hand, *Origenes* (in *Euseb.* hist. eccl. III. c. 1): Πέτρος — ἀνεσκολοπίσθη κατὰ κεφαλῆς, οὕτως αὐτὸς ἀξιώσας παθεῖν, translated by Rufinus: Crucifixus est deorsum capite demerso, quod ipse ita fieri deprecatus est, ne exæquari Domino videretur.

6 *Hieronymus* de script. eccles. c. 1.— *Eusebius* III. 2, says: μετὰ τὴν Παύλου καὶ Πέτρου μαρτυρίαν πρῶτος κληροῦται τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν Λῖνος · and, III. 4, he calls Clement, τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας τρίτος ἐπίσκοπος καταστάς. (Linus, — Anacletus, — Clemens.) Epiphanius also has the right notion concerning the episcopacy of the Apostles, hær. XXVII. 6: ἐν Ῥώμῃ γὰρ γεγονάσι πρῶτοι Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος οἱ Ἀπόστολοι αὐτοὶ καὶ Ἐπίσκοποι. —The tradition of the modern Roman Church is most fully developed in *Gregor. Cortesii* de romano itinere gestisque principis Apostolorum libri II. *Vincent. Alex. Constantius* recensuit, notis illustravit, annales SS. Petri et Pauli et appendicem monumentorum adjecit. Rom. 1770. 8vo.

7 *Clemens Alex.* Hypotypos. lib. VI. related (see *Euseb.* hist. eccl. II. c. 1. § 2.), Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν τοῦ σωτῆρος, ὡς ἂν καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου προτετιμημένους, μὴ ἐπιδικάζεσθαι δόξης, ἀλλὰ Ἰάκωβον τὸν δίκαιον ἐπίσκοπον τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων ἑλέσθαι.

8 Cf. Joseph. Ant. XX. 9. 1. et ap. Euseb. II. 23: Ὁ δὲ νεώτερος Ἄνανος, ὃν τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην ἔφαμεν παρειληφέναι, θρασὺς ἦν τὸν τρόπον, καὶ τολμητὴς διαφερόντως ·

Philip passed the last years of his life in Hierapolis in Phrygia (vid. Polycrates, who wrote about A. D. 190, ap. Euseb. hist. eccl. III. 31, and V. 24). *John* also went into Asia Minor; but the rest of his life belongs in the next period. There are also old traditions that *Thomas* carried the gospel to Parthia,[9] *Andrew* to Scythia (Origenes in Gen. iii. ap. Euseb. III. 1), *Bartholomew* to India (Euseb. V. 10; on the authority of Pantænus. Philostorg. hist. eccl. II. 6, calls the Sabæans, or Homerites, *τοὺς ἐνδοτάτω Ἰνδοὺς*), and that *John Mark*, at first the companion of Paul and Barnabas, and afterwards of Peter, founded a church in Alexandria (Euseb. II. 16). The later traditions concerning the Apostles and their immediate pupils, to which the wish of various nations to trace back their Christianity to the Apostolic age has not a little contributed, are at the best uncertain, and for the most part so extravagant as at once to betray their true character.[10]

αἵρεσιν δὲ μετῆκε τὴν Σαδδουκαίων, οἵπερ εἰσι περὶ τὰς κρίσεις ὠμοὶ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, καθὼς ἤδη δεδηλώκαμεν. Ἅτε δὴ οὖν τοιοῦτος ὢν ὁ Ἄνανος νομίσας ἔχειν καιρὸν ἐπιτήδειον, διὰ τὸ τεθνᾶναι μὲν Φῆστον, Ἀλβῖνον δὲ ἔτι κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ὑπάρχειν, καθίζει συνέδριον κριτῶν· καὶ παραγαγὼν εἰς αὐτὸ [τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ, Ἰάκωβος ὄνομα αὐτῷ, καί] τινας [ἑτέρους], ὡς παρανομησάντων κατηγορίαν ποιησάμενος, παρέδωκε λευσθησομένους. Ὅσοι δὲ ἐδόκουν ἐπιεικέστατοι κατὰ τὴν πόλιν εἶναι, καὶ τὰ περὶ τοὺς νόμους ἀκριβεῖς, βαρέως ἤνεγκαν ἐπὶ τούτῳ· καὶ πέμπουσιν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα κρύφα παρακαλοῦντες οὐτὸν ἐπιστεῖλαι τῷ Ἀνάνῳ, μηκέτι τοιαῦτα πράσσειν· μηδὲ γὰρ τὸ πρῶτον ὀρθῶς αὐτὸν πεπρᾶχθαι. Τινὲς δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ τὸν Ἀλβῖνον ὑπαντιάζουσιν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐδοιποροῦντα, καὶ διδάσκουσιν ὡς οὐκ ἐξὸν ἦν Ἀνάνῳ χωρὶς τῆς ἐκείνου γνώμης καθίσαι συνέδριον. Ἀλβῖνος δὲ, πεισθεὶς τοῖς λεγομένοις, γράφει μετ' ὀργῆς τῷ Ἀνάνῳ, λήψεσθαι παρ' αὐτοῦ δίκας ἀπειλῶν, καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀγρίππας διὰ τοῦτο τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην ἀφειλόμενος αὐτὸν ἄρξαντα μῆνας τρεῖς, Ἰησοῦν τὸν τοῦ Δαμναίου κατέστησεν. *Clericus* (art. crit. P. III. sect. 1, c. 15, § 12,) and *Lardner* (Suppl. vol. III. cap. 16, sect. 5,) reject the words in parentheses as spurious. — The story related by *Hegesippus* (ap. Euseb. hist. eccl. II. 23,) concerning the life and death of James, *ὁ ὀνομασθεὶς ὑπὸ πάντων δίκαιος*, — *καὶ Ὠβλίας, ὅ ἐστιν ἑλληνιστὶ περιοχὴ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ δικαιοσύνη* (עֹבֶל יָעֲקֹב Reines. var. lect. lib. III. — Ὠζλίαμ, עֹז יַעֲקֹב, Ps. xxix. 11. Fuller. Miscell. sacr. III.), seems to have been fabricated amongst the Ebionites, who made James what they considered the model of a Christian Ascetic. These traditions are much amplified by *Epiphanius* (hær. XXIX. 4, LXXVIII. 13).

9 More modern traditions relate that Thomas went to India. So first *Gregory Nazianz.* orat. XXV. ad Arian. p. 438, ed. Paris. *Ambrosius* in Psalm xlv. 10. *Hieronym.* epist. 148. Comp. Acta Thomæ Apostoli, ed. *J. C. Thilo.* Lips. 1823. The decidedly Manichæan character of this last work makes it highly probable that the whole tradition of his going to India is of Manichæan origin. Hence Theodoret. hær. fab. I. c. 26. asserts that the Thomas who was sent to India was a pupil of Manes.

10 Thus the Spaniards pretend that Paul and James the Elder were in their country (the bones of the latter have been preserved in Compostella since A. D. 816); the French claim Dionysius the Areopagite, Lazarus, Mary Magdalene, etc.; the English, Simon the Zealot, and especially Joseph of Arimathea; the Germans, Maternus, Eucharius, and Valerius as legates of Peter; the Russians, Andrew, etc. In many cases the real founders of the church are carried back into the time of the Apostles.

§ 28.

RECEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY AMONGST JEWS AND HEATHEN.
(Vid. § 19.)

Neander's Kirchengeschichte. Bd. 1. Abth. 1. S. 80 ff. (Neander's Eccl. Hist. Vol. I. Sect. 1. p. 61 seq. Lond. 1831. 8vo.)

With the Jews the greatest obstacle to the progress of Christianity lay in their false notions concerning the Messiah. That the Christians should admit the Samaritans into their company, and even, like Paul and his followers, the uncircumcised Heathen, was to them sufficient proof that these could not be the followers of the true Messiah; and it is probable that they always looked on Christianity as a mutilated form of Judaism, profaned by being shared with the Heathen, — as is expressed by the appellation מינים, which they (though perhaps somewhat later) bestowed on its converts. On these accounts Paul and his followers were the objects of peculiar hatred to the Jews of Palestine (Gal. v. 11; Rom. xv. 31). This went so far that it was reported of him that he had introduced Heathen into the Temple; and it was the commotion thus excited which led to his imprisonment (Acts xxi. 27). This event perhaps roused anew the hatred of the Jews towards the Judaizing Christians of Jerusalem, which since the death of Herod Agrippa, had lain dormant (vid. § 26); for not long after, the high priest Ananus availed himself of the opportunity afforded by the decease of the Procurator Festus to put the Apostle James to death (vid. § 27, note 8). — Amongst the Hellenistic Jews Paul found occasionally a ready reception of Christianity, as in *Berea* (Acts xvii. 11, 12), *Ephesus* (xviii. 19, 20), and *Rome* (xxviii. 17). In other places they were his most inveterate foes, as at Thessalonica (Acts xvii. 5), and Corinth (xviii. 12 seq.), probably not only from their national prejudices, but also from a fear lest the suspicions of the Romans might be aroused by publishing their hopes of a Messiah (Acts xvii. 6 – 8).

With the Heathen, apart from the inward power of Christian truth over the human mind, its progress was much facilitated by its miraculous origin, and the prevailing inclination to foreign superstition. On the other hand, the higher classes, and especially the philosophers (1 Cor. i. 18), were offended at its Jewish origin, its simplicity (Acts xvii. 18 seq.), and the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. As yet the Christians passed for a Jewish sect[1]: a circumstance, which from many perhaps may have drawn upon them contempt, but which had, at least the good effect of securing for them the protection of the government (Acts xviii. 12 seq.); the Christian societies, like the Jewish, being included amongst the *Sodalitia licita* (comp. § 17). It is true that com-

[1] *J. G. Krafft* proluss. II. de nascenti Christi ecclesia sectæ Judaicæ nomine tuta Erlang. 1771 – 72. — *J. H. Ph. Seidenstücker* diss. de Christianis ad Trajanum usque a Cæsaribus et Senatu Romano pro cultoribus religionis Mosaicæ semper habitis. Helmst. 1790.

plaints were occasionally brought against them as "teaching things not lawful for Romans to observe" (Acts xvi. 21); but these were overlooked by the magistrates, as had been formerly the partial conversion of many to Judaism; a forbearance owing, no doubt, to the increasing neglect of the ancient religious laws, and the general inclination to foreign religions (*peregrina sacra*). That *Claudius*, on occasion of a dispute between the believing and unbelieving Jews, expelled both parties from the city, cannot of course be considered a persecution of the Christians.[2] Neither were they persecuted by *Nero* on account of their faith, but that he might turn from himself the suspicion of having set the city on fire (A. D. 64).[3] This persecution was confined probably to Rome,[4] though it seems to have continued with some intermission till the death of the tyrant.[5]

§ 29.

INTERNAL RELATIONS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES.

The new Churches everywhere formed themselves on the model of the mother-church at Jerusalem. At the head of each were the *Elders* (πρεσβύτεροι, ἐπίσκοποι),[1] all officially of equal rank, though in

---

2 Sueton. in Claudio c. 25: Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit. cf. Act. xviii. 2. The play upon words, Χριστός, Χρηστός, was not uncommon, (Justin. Apol. maj. p. 45. Athenag. leg. 281, 282. Tertull. Apolog. 3.)

3 Tacit. ann. XV. 44. Sueton. Nero. c. 16.

4 So first *Henr. Dodwellus* in dissertt. Cyprianicarum (Oxon. 1684. 8vo.) diss. XI. de paucitate martyrum, § 13. On the other side *Theod. Ruinart* in præfat. ad acta Martyr. sincera, § 3. — The pretended inscription found in Spain or Portugal: Neroni ob provinciam latronibus et his, qui novam generi humano superstitionem inculcabant, purgatam (*Jan. Gruteri* inscriptt. T. I. p. 238, n. 9.), is spurious, originating perhaps with Cyriacus of Ancona, vid. *Ferreras* histoire d'Espagne tom. 1. p. 192. — Defended by *J. E. J. Walch* persecutionis Christianorum Neronianæ in Hispania ex ant. monumentis probandæ uberior explanatio. Jenæ. 1753. 4to. Comp. especially however the accompanying epistola *Hagenbuchii* p. 31 — 60.

5 The Christian tradition, that Nero would reappear as Antichrist to lead the last persecution, which grew out of the popular belief that Nero was not dead, but had escaped into the East, (Sueton. Nero, c. 57. comp. c. 40. — Whence the pretended Neros Suet. I. c. c. 57. Tacit. hist. II. c. 8. Dio Cassius 64. 10.) dates from a period very soon after his death. (Orac. Sibyllin. IV. 116, which verses must have been written about the year 80. See F. Bleek über d. Sibyll. Orakel, in Schleiermachers, De Wettes und Lückes theol. Zeitschrift. Heft. 1. Berlin. 1819. S. 248. ff.) It survived, however, for many centuries. vid. *Lactantius* de morte Persecut. c. 2.; *Sulpic. Sever.* hist. sacr. II. 28, § 1. 29, § 6, dial. II. c. 14.; *Hieronym.* in Daniel. xi. 28, in Esaiam xvii. 13, ad Algasiam qu. XI.; and it was even thought that Paul referred to Nero in 2 Thess. ii. 7. vid. *Chrysostom.*, *Theodoret.*, *Theophyl.*, and *Œcum.* cf. ad h. l. *Augustin.* de civ. Dei, XX. c. 19.

1 That these names are the same, follows from Act. xx. 17, 28; Tit. i. 5, 7; Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 1, 8. Acknowledged by *Hieronymus*, *Epist.* 82 (al. 83) *ad Oceanum:* Apud veteres iidem Episcopi et Presbyteri, quia illud nomen dignitatis est, hoc ætatis. *Epist.* 101, *ad Evangelum.* See under § 32, n. 2. —*Idem ad Tit.* i. 7:

several instances a peculiar authority seems to have been conceded to

---

Idem est ergo Presbyter, qui Episcopus; et antequam diaboli instinctu studia in religione fierent, et diceretur in populis, Ego sum Pauli, ego Apollo, ego autem Cephæ, communi Presbyterorum consilio ecclesiæ gubernabantur. Postquam vero unusquisque eos, quos baptizaverat, suos putabat esse, non Christi; in toto orbe decretum est, ut unus de Presbyteris electus superponeretur cæteris, ad quem omnis ecclesiæ cura pertineret, et schismatum semina tollerentur. Putat aliquis non Scripturarum, sed nostram esse sententiam, Episcopum et Presbyterum unum esse; et aliud ætatis, aliud esse nomen officii: relegat Apostoli ad Philippenses verba, dicentis: — here follow the passages cited above. Then: Hæc propterea, ut ostenderemus, apud veteres eosdem fuisse Presbyteros, quos et Episcopos: paulatim vero, ut dissensionum plantaria evellerentur, ad unum omnem sollicitudinem esse delatam. Sicut ergo Presbyteri sciunt, se ex ecclesiæ consuetudine ei, qui sibi præpositus fuerit, esse subjectos: ita Episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine, quam dispositionis dominicæ veritate, Presbyteris esse majores, et in commune debere ecclesiam regere. *Augustini* Epist. 82, ad Hieron. c. 33. — cf. *Chrysostomi* hom. I. in Philipp. i. *Theodoret.* in Philipp. i. 1. It is remarkable how long this notion of the original sameness of Bishops and Presbyters was retained. *Isidorus Hispal.* Etymol. VII. c. 12, copies the passage from Hieron. Epist. ad Oceanum. *Bernaldus* Constantiensis (about 1088), the most zealous defender of Gregory VII., after citing Jerome in his *de Presbyterorum officio tract.* (in Monumentorum res Allemannorum illustrantt. S. Blas. 1792. 4to. T. II. p. 384 seq.), continues: Quum igitur Presbyteri et Episcopi antiquitus idem fuisse legantur, etiam eandem ligandi atque solvendi potestatem et alia nunc Episcopis specialia habuisse non dubitantur. Postquam autem Presbyteri ab episcopali excellentia cohibiti sunt, cœpit eis non licere, quod licuit, videlicet quod ecclesiastica auctoritas solis Pontificibus exequendum delegavit. Even Pope Urban II. in *Conc. Benevent.* ann. 1091. can. 1: Sacros autem ordines dicimus Diaconatum et Presbyteratum. Hos siquidem solos primitiva legitur ecclesia habuisse: super his solum præceptum habemus Apostoli. Hence Gratian adopts without hesitation the passages, *Hieron.* ad Tit. i. (Dist. XCV. c. 5), *Epist. ad Evangel.* (Dist. XCIII. c. 21) and *Isidori Hisp.* (Dist. XXI. c. 1). Also *Nicol. Tudeschus*, *Archiep. Panormitanus* (about A. D. 1428) *super prima parte Primi cap.* 5, (ed. Lugdun. 1547. fol. 112 b): Olim Presbyteri in commune regebant ecclesiam et ordinabant sacerdotes. It is, perhaps, still more remarkable that even the papal Canonist, *Jo. Paul. Lancelottus* (about 1570) in his *Institutt. Juris Canon. lib. I. Tit.* 21, § 3, introduces the passage of Jerome without any attempt to refute it. The distinction between the institutio divina et ecclesiastica was of less importance in the middle ages, than in the modern Catholic church, and this view of the original identity of Bishops and Presbyters was of no practical importance. It was not till after the Reformation that it was attacked. *Michael de Medina* (about A. D. 1570) does not hesitate to assert, illos Patres materiales fuisse hæreticos, sed in his Patribus ob eorum reverentiam hoc dogma non esse damnatum. *Bellarminus* de clericis lib. I. c. 15, calls this sententiam valde inconsideratam, and prefers rather to resort to interpretation. Since this all Catholics, as well as the English Episcopalians, maintain an original difference between bishop and presbyter. Comp. especially *Petavii* de ecclesiastica hierarchia libb. V. and dissertatt. theologic. lib. I., in his theolog dogmat. Tom. IV. p. 164. On the other side, *Walonis Messalini* (Claud. Salmasii) diss. de episcopis et presbyteris. Lugd. Bat. 1641. 8vo. *Dav. Blondelli* apologia pro sententia Hieronymi de episcopis et presbyteris. Amstelod. 1646 4to. Against these *Henr. Hammondus* dissertatt. IV., quibus episcopatus jura ex sacra scriptura et prima antiquitate adstruuntur. Lond. 1651. The controversy was long continued. On the side of the Episcopalians *Jo. Pearson*, *Guil. Beveridge*, *Henr. Dodwell*, *Jos. Bingham*, *Jac. Usserius*. On that of the Presbyterians, *Jo. Dallæus*, *Camp. Vitringa*; also the Lutherans, *Joach. Hildebrand*, *Just. Henn. Boehmer*, *Jo. Franc. Buddeus*, *Christ. Matth. Pfaff*, etc. comp *Jo. Phil. Gabler* de episcopis primæ ecclesiæ Christ. eorumque origine diss. Jenæ. 1805. 4to.

some one individual from personal considerations.[2] Under the superintendence of the Elders were the Deacons and Deaconesses (Rom. xvi. 1; 1 Tim. v. 9, 10). All these received their support, like the poor, from the free contributions of the church (1 Tim. v. 17; 1 Cor. ix. 13). It was by no means any part of the duty of the Elders to teach,[3] although the Apostle wishes that they may be apt to teach (διδακτικοί) (1 Tim. iii. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 24). The power of speaking and exhortation was considered rather the free gift of the spirit (χάρισμα πνευματικόν), and was possessed by many of the Christians, though exercised in different ways (*prophets, — teachers, — speaking with tongues*, 1 Cor. xii. 28–31; ch. xiv.). There was as yet no distinct order of clergy, for the whole society of Christians was a "royal priesthood" (1 Petr. ii. 9) — "the chosen people of God" (1 Petr. v. 3; comp. Deut. iv. 20; ix. 29).[4] They assembled for worship in private houses; in cities the churches were often divided into several societies each having its particular place of meeting.[5]

In their assemblies the exercises consisted in reading the Scriptures of the Old Testament, explanation of what had been read, exhortation, singing,[6] and prayer (Col. iii. 16; 1 Tim. iv. 13). The letters of Paul too were read and sent from one church to another (Col. iv. 16; 1 Thess. v. 27). The communion supper was with them an

---

2 Thus James, who always remained in Jerusalem, was considered as the head of that church (Gal. i. 19; ii. 12; Acts xxi. 18), and hence may be regarded as the first bishop in the more modern acceptation of the word. Thus Epiphras at Colossæ (Col. i. 7; iv. 12), seems for a time to have had a certain authority; as afterwards Archippus (Col. iv. 17; Philem. i. 2; comp. Phil. iv. 3.)

3 Against the distinction of *presbyteri docentes* and *regentes* (first made by *Calvin.* institutt. christ. relig. lib. IV. c. 3, § 8: verbi ministros s. episcopos and gubernatores s. seniores ex plebe delectos, — whence the Presbyterian form of church government), see *Vitringa* de synag. vetere lib. II. c. 2.

4 Cf. *Tertullian* de exhort. castit. c. 7. *Ambrosiaster* (Hilarius Diaconus?), about A. D. 380, in comment. ad Ephes. iv. 11: Primum omnes docebant et omnes baptizabant, quibuscumque diebus vel temporibus fuisset occasio; nec enim Philippus tempus quæsivit aut diem, quo eunuchum baptizaret neque jejunium interposuit. — — — — Ut ergo cresceret plebs et multiplicaretur, omnibus inter initia concessum est et evangelizare et baptizare et scripturas in ecclesia explanare. At ubi omnia loca complexa est ecclesia, conventicula constituta sunt et rectores, et cætera officia in ecclesiis sunt ordinata, ut nullus de clericis [ceteris?] auderet, qui ordinatus non esset, præsumere officium, quod sciret non sibi creditum vel concessum. Et cœpit alio ordine et providentia gubernari ecclesia, quia si omnes eadem possent, irrationabile esset, et vulgaris res et vilissima videretur. Hinc ergo est, unde nunc neque diaconi in populo prædicant, neque clerici vel laici baptizant, neque quocunque die credentes tinguntur, nisi ægri. *Ideo non per omnia conveniunt scripta Apostoli ordinationi, quæ nunc in ecclesia est, quia hæc inter primordia sunt scripta.*

5 ἐκκλησίαι κατ' οἶκον, Rom. xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 19; Philem. v. 2; Col. iv. 15, comp. Kist over den Oorsprong van het Bisschoppeligk gezag etc. in the *Archief voor Kerkelijke Geschiedenis.* Decl. 2.

6 On the nature of this singing vid. Isidor. Hispal. de eccles. offic. I. 5: Primitiva ecclesia ita psallebat, ut modico flexu vocis faceret psallentem resonare, ita ut pronuntianti vicinior esset quam canenti (taken from Augustine, Confession. X, 33, 2; [Alexandrinus Episcopus Athanasius] tam modico flexu vocis faciebat sonare lectorem Psalmi, ut pronuntianti vicinior esset quam canenti.)

actual evening meal (ἀγάπη), vid. 1 Cor. xi. 20.[7] In token of their fraternal affection they saluted each other in their assemblies, with a kiss (φίλημα ἀγάπης, φίλημα ἅγιον); vid. Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Petr. v. 14. In all other respects each church was left to make its own particular regulations, all innocent national customs being observed (1 Cor. xi. 4). Whilst the Christians of Palestine, who kept the whole Jewish law, celebrated of course all the Jewish festivals, the Heathen converts observed only the Sabbath, and, in remembrance of the closing scenes of our Saviour's life, the Passover (1 Cor. v. 6–8), though without the Jewish superstitions (Gal. iv. 10; Col. ii. 16). Besides these the Sunday, as the day of our Saviour's resurrection (Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2. — Apocalypse i. 10. ἡ κυριακὴ ἡμέρα),[8] was devoted to religious worship. Immoral members were excluded from the church (1 Cor. v. 2–13), and received again only on condition of repentance and reformation (2 Cor. ii. 5–8). The Apostles had the general superintendence of all the churches, and were *co-presbyters* in each particular church (συμπρεσβύτεροι, 1 Petr. v. 1). Not only were they distinguished generally as being Apostles of the Heathen or of the Circumcision (Gal. ii. 7–9), but each devoted his labors more particularly though not exclusively to the churches, which he himself had founded (Rom. xv. 20). The first arrangement of the new churches and the appointment of the Presbyters was superintended by the Apostles themselves (Acts xiv. 23); Paul often left behind one of his assistants for this purpose (Acts xvii. 14; 1 Tim. i. 3 seq.; Tit. i. 5 seq.), who then had nearly the same duties to perform which afterwards devolved on the bishops, though not bound to any particular church. They belonged rather to the class of the *evangelists* (εὐαγγελισταί, 2 Tim. iv. 5).

The Christians distinguished themselves from the rest of the world (ὁ κόσμος, ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος) as a chosen people consecrated to God ἅγιοι,[9] ἐκλεκτοί, κλητοί (the saints, — the elect, — the called). These expressions did not imply any claim to moral perfection, but only referred to their "high calling in Christ." For though from the first many of the converts to Christianity were spiritually enlightened and morally regenerated, it was not possible that they should *all* be at once freed from the prejudices and vices of their age and nation.[10] When we

---

[7] *J. Theoph. Frid. Drescher* de veterum Christianorum agapis comm. Giessæ 1824. 8vo.

[8] The presumption founded on these passages is confirmed by the passage in *Epist. Barnab. c.* 15: ἄγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ὀγδόην εἰς εὐφροσύνην, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς· in which the observance of the Sunday is spoken of as a thing established. Cf. *C. Chr. L. Franke* de diei dominici apud veteres Christianos celebratione comm. Halæ. 1826. 8vo.

[9] As the Jews called themselves עַם־קְדוֹשִׁים, Dan. viii. 24. cf. vii. 18, 21, 22, 25.

[10] The descriptions of *William Cave*, Primitive christianity, or the religion of the ancient christians in the first ages of the gospel. Lond. ed. 5. 1689; and Gottfr. Arnolds Erste Liebe d. i. wahre Abbildung der ersten Christen u. s. w. Frankf. 1690. fol. Leipz. 1732. 4to.; are exceedingly partial. *L. A. Paetz* comm. de vi, quam religio christ. per III. priora sæcula ad hominum animos

consider the state of religious knowledge (comp. § 14, 15,) and how many must have been led to embrace Christianity from superstition, or other still worse motives, it will not seem wonderful that in the Apostolic age we meet with many errors and even gross vices. Amongst the *Jewish* converts, especially in Palestine, there always continued to be a party, who maintained that the Mosaic law, in all its strictness, was binding on their Heathen brethren; thus occasioning much confusion in the church (vid. Galatians). All Jewish Christians believed it binding on themselves (Acts xxi. 20, 21). Amongst the *Heathen* converts the introduction of philosophy into Christianity led to errors of a different kind. As far as we have any information on the subject, *Apollos*, a learned Jew of Alexandria, was the first Christian who brought forward such a speculative view of his religion, which he advocated with great eloquence at Corinth. Although probably he had no such intention, the effect of his teaching was to impair the influence of Paul with many of the Corinthians, and this led to divisions amongst them (1 Cor. ch. i. — ch. iv.). Paul contents himself with reproving these dissensions, leaving all such philosophical speculations to be tried by their own merits (1 Cor. iii. 11). Sometimes, however, they affected important points of Christian faith, especially the resurrection of the body, a doctrine always peculiarly offensive to the Heathen, whilst, with the Apostle, it was intimately connected with his views of final retribution (1 Thess. iv. 13–18; 1 Cor. xv. 12. — Hymenæus and Philetus, 2 Tim. ii. 18). We find also amongst the early Christians many of the vices of the Heathen, especially in Corinth (1 Cor. v. 6) and in Crete (Tit. i. 10 seq.), nor is it surprising that, in the corrupt and degraded state of philosophy, speculations of a directly immoral tendency should occasionally have found their way even here (2 Petr. ii.; Jude 4 seq.; 2 Tim. iii. 2 seq.) At the same time the prevailing belief in the efficacy of external observances in producing internal purity, led many of the Heathen converts to conform themselves to the requisitions of the Mosaic law, or else to adopt a strange mixture of Jewish and Pagan superstitions (1 Cor. vii.; 1 Tim. iv. 3; Col. ii. 8–18). In the writings of Paul we find general warnings against this extravagant spirit of speculation (Col. ii. 8; 1 Tim. i. 5–7; iv. 7; vi. 20; Tit. iii. 9); though he recommended tolerance even towards error, if harmless, — "to receive those who are weak in the faith, though not to doubtful disputations" (Rom. xiv. 1 seq.). As to all ascetic practices, he wishes them to be entirely voluntary. He recommends celibacy, indeed, on account of the "present distress" (1 Cor. vii. 26), but leaves every one to his own choice (1 Cor. vii.), whilst he is warmly excited against those who

---

mores ac vitam habuit. Gotting. 1799. 4to., is sometimes unfair to the Christians, but otherwise very valuable. Vid. A. Neander das christliche Leben der drei ersten Jahrhunderte (in his Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Geschichte des Christenthums und des christlichen Lebens. Bd. I. Berlin. 1823.) — *J. G. Stickel* et *C. F. Bogenhard* biga commentationum de morali primævorum Christianorum conditione. Neostad. ad Orlam. 1826. 8vo.

would impose laws on this liberty (1 Tim. iv. 3). — *Fasts* were undertaken only from choice, and as an appropriate preparation for prayer (Acts xiii. 2, 3; xiv. 23). What Paul's opinion of prescribed fasts would have been, may be inferred from Rom. xiv. 2, 17; Gal. iv. 10; 1 Tim. iv. 3; Col. ii. 20–23.

In strong relief to these faults, which belonged to their time, are the brotherly love, the benevolence, the patient endurance (Heb. x. 32), and especially the holy zeal of the early Christians. Particularly attractive is the tender attachment of the church at Philippi to Paul. (Vid. Ep. to the Philippians.)

CHAPTER THIRD.

TIME OF JOHN. A. D. 70—117.

§ 30.

FATE OF THE JUDAIZING CHRISTIANS IN PALESTINE.

After the flight of the Christians of Jerusalem to Pella, immediately on the breaking out of the Jewish war, the connexion of this with the other churches was no longer so intimate as before, nor its authority so undisputed. To the Jews these Christians were still the objects of most bitter hatred, as is proved by the work entitled בִּרְכַּת הַמִּינִים, which appeared about this time.[1] That they were also exposed to bloody persecutions[2] is seen by the death of Simeon, the successor of

---

1 Samuel the Little is their reputed author. He is supposed to have written them at the instance of the Rabbi Gamaliel in *Jafne*, where the Sanhedrim was held after the destruction of Jerusalem (Talmud. Hierosol. et Babylon. in tract. Berachoth). Hence this *Gamaliel* cannot be the elder Gamaliel, but his grandson. Cf. Vitringa de Synagog. vet. p. 1047. — On the name מינים vid. *Fulleri* miscellan. theologic. lib. II. c. 3. *G. E. Edzardus* in not. ad Avoda Sara, p. 253 seq. — *Hieronym.* ep. 89 ad Augustin.: Usque hodie per totas orientis synagogas inter Judæos hæresis est, quæ dicitur *Minæorum* et a Pharisæis nunc usque damnatur, quos vulgo *Nazaræos* nuncupant, qui credunt in Christum, filium Dei, natum de virgine Maria, et eum dicunt esse, qui sub Pontio Pilato passus est et resurrexit: in quem et nos credimus: sed dum volunt et Judæi esse et Christiani, nec Judæi sunt nec Christiani.

2 *Jo. Malelæ* (about A. D. 600) hist. chron. (ed. Oxon. 1691. 8vo. p. 356), contains the following *Relatio* of Tiberianus, a governor of Palestine, which if it were genuine would belong to this period: Ἀπίκαμον τιμωρούμενος καὶ φωνεύων τοὺς Γαλιλαίους, τοὺς τοῦ δόγματος τῶν λεγομένων Χριστιανῶν κατὰ τὰ ὑμέτερα θεσπίσματα· καὶ οὐ παύονται ἑαυτοὺς μηνύοντες εἰς τὸ ἀναιρεῖσθαι· ὅθεν ἐκοτίασα τούτοις παραινῶν καὶ ἀπειλῶν, μὴ τολμᾷν αὐτοὺς μηνύειν μοι ὑτάρχοντας ἐκ τοῦ προειρημένου δόγματος· καὶ ἀποδιωκόμενοι οὐ παύονται. Θεσπίσαι μοι οὖν καταξιώσατε τὰ παριστάμενα τῷ ὑμετέρῳ κράτει τροπαιοῦχοι. But *Dodwell* Dissertt. Cypr. diss. XI. § 23, and *Tillemont*, note 2, sur la persécut. de Trajan (in the Mémoires ed. Bruxelles. 8vo. Tom. II. P. II. p. 433 seq.), have satisfactorily shown this *Relation* to be spurious.

James, who was crucified in the 126th year of his age (A. D. 107)[3]. After his death there arose a division in the church itself. Ever since the council of the Apostles at Jerusalem (Acts xv.) there had always been a difference of opinion on the subject then discussed (vid. § 29), which led at length[4] to an entire separation; some adhering to the views of the Apostles (*Nazaræans*), whilst the other party maintained that the Christian converts were bound to observe the whole Mosaic law, and that Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary. These last were afterwards called *Ebionites*, which seems to have been originally a term of derision applied by the Jews to all Christians alike.[5] Whilst this party were distinguished by their superstitious observance of the Pharisaical law, another sect was formed by mingling the doctrines of the Essenes with Christianity, and were called *Elkesaites*,[6] or *Sampsæans*.[7]

§ 31.

FATE OF THE CHRISTIANS IN THE OTHER PROVINCES OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

After the destruction of Jerusalem the Heathen converts were everywhere so numerous that it was no longer possible wholly to confound Christianity with Judaism. Still the Christians were regarded as a Jewish sect, and of course shared in the embittered hatred with which the Jews were regarded since their insurrection. At the same time the new religion was evidently more to be feared than

---

3 *Hegesippus* ap. Euseb. hist. eccl. III. 32; he is here called Συμεὼν τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, and, according to Euseb. III. 11, is ἀνεψιὸς τοῦ Σωτῆρος, the Σίμων Matth. xiii. 55, therefore a brother of James. Later writers have identified him also with the Apostle Simon the Zealot. So Sophronius in the Append. to Hieronym. de viris illustribus. On the other hand, see *Sam. Basnage* annales politico-ecclesiastici (Roterod. 1706.) ad A. C. 31, Num. 72.

4 *Hegesippus* ap. Euseb. h. e. IV. 22. Gieseler's Abhandl. von den Nazaräern und Ebioniten in Stäudlins und Tzschirners Archiv, Bd. IV. St. 2. S. 320.

5 Hence in *Origenes* contra Cels. lib. V., we have Ἐβιωναῖοι ἀμφότεροι, Ἐβ. διττοί. — The derivation of the name from a certain Ebion occurs first in *Tertullian.* de præscr. hæret. c. 33. In the Talmud. Hierosolymit. tract. Joma. fol. 4, col. 3, we read not אֲבִיוֹן, as *Lightfoot* (parergon de excid. urbis, Opp. T. II. p. 148) asserts, but ר' אֶבְיוֹן. — Comp. Gieseler Abhandl. S. 297 ff. 306 ff.

6 *Epiphanius* (hær. XIX.) supposes this sect to have been formed in the time of Trajan by a certain Elxai (according to him חֵיל and כֻּבָּה) from the Jewish sect of the Ὀσσηνοί. — *Origen* (ap. Euseb. h. e. VI. 38) calls then on the other hand νεωστὶ ἐπανισταμένη. Various conjectures concerning the name אַלְכַּחְשַׁיִן (from כחש, negare) apostatæ Baumgartens Gesch. der Religionspartheien, S. 271. from אֵל שַׁדַּי *Nitzsch* de testamentis XII Patriarch. comm. (Viteberg. 1810.) pag. 5: according to Scaliger Ἐλξαὶ אל הכא' ὁ Ἐσσαῖος (Petavii comm. ad Epiph. hær. XIX.)

7 *Epiph.* hær. 33. Σαμψαίοι ἑρμηνεύονται Ἡλιακοί (from שֶׁמֶשׁ).

Judaism had ever before been, inasmuch as it was not confined to one nation, but was spreading with unexampled rapidity over the whole world.[1] Notwithstanding this, the persecutions which the Christians underwent were only partial. *Vespasian* (A. D. 70 – 79) never molested them as Christians, though they may very probably have been harassed during his and the following reign (under *Titus* A. D. 79 – 81), by the demand of the tax levied on the Jews. This was still more the case under *Domitian* (A. D. 81 – 96),[2] who also put to death several Christians at Rome,[3] and caused a search to be made in Palestine for the posterity of David. In this reign the Apostle John was banished to Patmos. Under *Nerva* (A. D. 96 – 98) the Christians were not molested.[4] In the reign of Trajan (A. D. 98 – 117) we find the first traces of that popular fury against them, of which they were afterwards so often the victims (Euseb. III. 32). Pliny, being appointed governor of Bithynia, where the Christians had become very numerous, and finding no especial law by which to govern himself, put in force with regard to them the general laws lately revived by Trajan against the really dangerous "secret societies" (Hetærias) cf. Plin. epist. X. 42, 43. The account of the Christians, which he sent to Trajan, and which is of great historial value, led to

---

1 Prevailing notions concerning the Christians: *Tacit.* Annal. XV. 44: — — quos per flagitia invisos, vulgus Christianos appellabat. Auctor nominis ejus Christus, Tiberio imperitante, per Procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat. Repressaque in præsens exitiabilis superstitio rursus erumpebat non modo per Judæam, originem ejus mali, sed per urbem etiam, quo cuncta undique atrocia aut pudenda confluunt celebranturque. — — — Odio humani generis convicti sunt. *Sueton.* in Nerone c. 16: Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis novæ ac maleficæ. Compare the notions concerning the Jews § 16, note 4.

2 The δίδραχμος was paid to Jupiter Capitolinus. Joseph. de B. J. VII. 6, 6. *Sueton.* in Domitiano, c. 12: Præter cæteros Judaicus fiscus acerbissime actus est: ad quem deferebantur, *qui vel improfessi Judaicam vivcrent vitam*, vel dissimulata origine imposita genti tributa non pependissent. Interfuisse me adolescentulum memini, quum a procuratore frequentissimoque consilio inspiceretur nonagenarius senex, an circumsectus esset. — *Petri Zornii* historia Fisci Judaici sub imperio vett. Roman. Alton. 1734.

3 *Xiphilini* epitome Dionis Cass. 67, 14: τὸν Φάβιον Κλήμεντα ὑπατεύοντα, καίτερ ἀνεψιὸν ὄντα, καὶ γυναῖκα καὶ αὐτὴν συγγενῆ ἑαυτοῦ Φλαβίαν Δομιτίλλαν ἔχοντα καταστρεψὲν ὁ Δομιτιανός. ἐπηνέχθη δὲ ἀμφοῖν ἔγκλημα ἀθεότητος· ὑφ' ἧς καὶ ἄλλοι ἐς τὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἤθη ἐξοκέλλοντες πολλοὶ κατεδικάσθησαν· καὶ οἱ μὲν ἀπέθανον, οἱ δὲ τῶν γοῦν οὐσιῶν ἐστερήθησαν· ἡ δὲ Δομιτίλλα ὑστερωρίσθη μόνον εἰς Πανδατέριειαν. — (ἄθεος i. e. ὁ μὴ σεβόμενος τοὺς θεούς.) *Eusebii* Chron. lib. II. ad Olymp. 218: Πολλοὶ δὲ Χριστιανῶν ἐμαρτύρησαν κατὰ Δομετιανόν, ὡς ὁ Βρέτιος (*Hieron.* Brutius. *Chron. pasch.* Brutus) ἱστορεῖ, ἐν οἷς καὶ Φλαυία Δομετίλλα, ἐξαδελφὴ Κλήμηντος Φλαυίου ὑπατικοῦ, ὡς χριστιανὴ εἰς νῆσον Πεντίαν φυγαδεύεται· αὐτός τε Κλήμης ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ ἀναιρεῖται. cf. *Ejusd.* hist. eccl. III. c. 18, § 2. According to *Hieronymi* Epist. 86 (al. 27) ad Eustochium Virg. Epitaphium Paulæ matris, Paula had seen, on the island Pontia, the cellulas, in quibus illa (Flavia Domitilla) longum martyrium duxerat. [Murdock's Mosh. I. 691. — Tr.]

4 *Xiphilini* epit. Dionis 68, 1: ὁ Νερούας τούς τε κρινομένους ἐπ' ἀσεβείᾳ ἀφῆκε καὶ τοὺς φεύγοντας κατήγαγε· — — τοῖς δὲ δὴ ἄλλοις οὔτ' ἀσεβείας, οὔτ' Ἰουδαϊκοῦ βίου καταιτιᾶσθαί τινας συνεχώρησε. The medal of the senate: *Fisci Judaici calumnia sublata.* See *Eckhel* doctrina numor. Veter. VI. p. 405.

the first edict which had ever been issued concerning the course to be pursued with them;[5] to which Ignatius, bishop of Antioch (A. D. 116) fell a sacrifice.[6]

---

[5] *Plinii Lib. X. Epist.* 96 (al. 97): C. Plinius Trajano. Solemne est mihi, Domine, omnia, de quibus dubito, ad Te referre. Quis enim potest melius vel cunctationem meam regere, vel ignorantiam instruere? Cognitionibus de Christianis interfui nunquam: ideo nescio, quid et quatenus aut puniri soleat, aut quæri. Nec mediocriter hæsitavi, sitne aliquod discrimen ætatum, an quamlibet teneri nihil a robustioribus differant: deturne pœnitentiæ venia, an ei, qui omnino Christianus fuit, desisse non prosit: nomen ipsum etiamsi flagitiis careat, an flagitia cohærentia nomini puniantur. Interim in iis, qui ad me tanquam Christiani deferebantur, hunc sum secutus modum. Interrogavi ipsos, an essent Christiani: confitentes iterum ac tertio interrogavi, supplicium minatus: perseverantes duci jussi. Neque enim dubitabam, qualecunque esset quod faterentur, pervicaciam certe et inflexibilem obstinationem debere puniri. Fuerunt alii similis amentiæ: quos, quia cives Romani erant, annotavi in urbem remittendos. Mox ipso tractatu, ut fieri solet, diffundente se crimine, plures species inciderunt. Propositus est libellus sine auctore, multorum nomina continens, qui negarent. se esse Christianos, aut fuisse, cum præeunte me Deos appellarent, et imagini Tuæ, quam propter hoc jusseram cum simulacris numinum afferri, thure ac vino supplicarent, præterea maledicerent Christo, quorum nihil cogi posse dicuntur, qui sunt revera Christiani. Ergo dimittendos putavi. Alii ab indice nominati, esse se Christianos dixerunt, et mox negaverunt: fuisse quidem, sed desisse, quidam ante triennium, quidam ante plures annos, non nemo etiam ante viginti quoque. Omnes et imaginem Tuam, Deorumque simulacra venerati sunt: ii et Christo maledixerunt. Affirmabant autem, hanc fuisse summam vel culpæ suæ, vel erroris, quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo, quasi Deo, dicere secum invicem: seque sacramento, non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent; quibus peractis morem sibi discedendi fuisse, rursusque coeundi ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen et innoxium; quod ipsum facere desisse post edictum meum, quo secundum mandata tua hetærias esse vetueram. Quo magis necessarium credidi, ex duabus ancillis, quæ ministræ dicebantur, quid esset veri, et per tormenta quærere. Sed nihil aliud inveni, quam superstitionem pravam et immodicam: ideoque dilata cognitione ad consulendum te decurri. Visa est enim mihi res digna consultatione, maxime propter periclitantium numerum. Multi enim omnis ætatis, omnis ordinis, utriusque sexus etiam, vocantur in periculum, et vocabuntur. Neque enim civitates tantum, sed vicos etiam atque agros superstitionis istius contagio pervagata est. Quæ videtur sisti et corrigi posse. Certe satis constat, prope jam desolata templa cœpisse celebrari, et sacra solemnia diu intermissa repeti, passimque venire victimas, quarum adhuc rarissimus emtor inveniebatur. Ex quo facile est opinari, quæ turba hominum emendari possit, si sit pœnitentiæ locus.

Ibid. Ep. 97. (al. 98): Trajanus Plinio. Actum, quem debuisti, mi Secunde, in excutiendis causis eorum, qui Christiani ad te delati fuerant, secutus es. Neque enim in universum aliquid, quod quasi certam formam habeat, constitui potest. Conquirendi non sunt: si deferantur et arguantur, puniendi sunt, ita tamen, ut qui negaverit se Christianum esse, idque re ipsa manifestum fecerit, i. e. supplicando Diis nostris, quamvis suspectus in præteritum fuerit, veniam ex pœnitentia impetret. Sine auctore vero propositi libelli, nullo crimine locum habere debent: nam et pessimi exempli, nec nostri seculi est. These letters are mentioned by Tertullian (Apologet. c. 2) and Eusebius (Chron. lib. I. p. 67, ed. Scaliger). In answer to the doubts of Gibbon, Semler, and Corrodi, concerning their genuineness, see A. C. Haversaat's Vertheidigung der Plinischen Briefe über die Christen, and Gierig in his ed. Plinii Epist. Tom. II. (Lips. 1802) p. 498. — Comment. to these Epistles: *Franc. Balduini* comm. ad edicta veterum Principum Rom. de Christianis. *Just. Henr. Boehmeri* XII. dissertatt. juris eccles. ant. ad Plin. Sec. et Tertullianum. ed. 2. Halæ. 1729.

[6] See Acta Martyrii Ignatii in *Ruinart* and elsewhere.

§ 32.

INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

Of the Apostles there now remained only *Philip* in Hierapolis (Polycrates ap. Euseb. hist. eccl. III. 31 et V. 24) and *John* at Ephesus, of whom the last, in particular, exercised a wide influence by his superintendence of the churches of Asia Minor, his writings, and the able men formed under his instructions.[1] After the death of the Apostles and the pupils of the Apostles, to whom the general direction of the churches had always been conceded, some one amongst the presbyters of each church was suffered gradually to take the lead in its affairs.[2] In the same irregular way the title of ἐπίσκοπος (bishop)

---

[1] John's exile to Patmos according to Iren. III. 3. cf. Tertull. de præscript. hær. 36: Apostolus Johannes posteaquam in oleum igneum demersus nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur. — Compelled to swallow poison. cf. Fabricii cod. Apocr. Novi Test. T. II. p. 576. *Thilo* Acta Thomæ, in the notitia on p. LXXIII. — Died in the reign of Trajan (Iren. II. 29; III. 3): according to Euseb. Chron. and Hieron, cat. c. 9, in the third year of Trajan's reign (A. D. 100). — Traditions, growing out of John xxi. 22: one that he laid himself down living in his grave, Fabric. l. c. p. 588. Thilo l. c. LXXIV; the other, that like Enoch and Elias he was translated to heaven, see Pseudo-Hippolytus de consumm. mundi (in Hipp. Opp. ed. Fabric. App. p. 14), and Ephraemius Antioch. about A. D. 526 (in Photii Bibl. cod. 229, ed. Rothomag. p. 798 seq.) — *Names:* virgo, παρθένος (so ran probably the signature to the 1st and 2d Epistles of John: ἐπιστ. Ἰωαννου τοῦ παρθένου: the Latins not understanding it made of this *Epistolam ad Parthos*), and (especially after the Council of Nice) θεολόγος.

[2] Comp. § 29, not. 1 and 4, and Gabler's Dissert. there cited. *Ambrosiaster* about 380, in *comment. ad* 1 *Tim.* iii. 10: Episcopi et Presbyteri una ordinatio est. Uterque enim sacerdos est, sed Episcopus primus est; ut omnis Episcopus Presbyter sit, non tamen omnis Presbyter Episcopus: hic enim Episcopus est, qui inter Presbyteros primus est. We find the latest traces of this relation between Bishops and Presbyters in *Hieronym.* Epist. 101 (al. 85) *ad Evangelum* (in the old ed. erroneously *ad Evagrium*, also in Gratianus Dist. XCIII. c. 24): Apostolus perspicue docet eosdem esse Presbyteros, quos Episcopos. — Quæris auctoritatem? Audi testimonium. Then he cites Phil. i. 1, Acts xx. 28, etc. Quod autem postea unus electus est, qui cæteris præponeretur, in schismatis remedium factum est, ne unusquisque ad se trahens Christi ecclesiam rumperet. Nam et Alexandriæ a Marco Evangelista usque ad Heraclam et Dionysium Episcopos (about A. D. 240) Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum, in excelsiori gradu collocatum, Episcopum nominabant. Quomodo si exercitus Imperatorem faciat, aut Diaconi eligant de se, quem industrium noverint, et Archidiaconum vocent. (Comp. on this letter *Chr. Waechtler*, Acta Eruditorum, ann. 1717, p. 484 seq., 524 seq. More lately the letter ad Evangelum has been pronounced spurious by P. Molkenbuhr, whom Binterim Denkwürdigk. d. christkath. Kirche Bd. 2. Th. 1. S. 70 ff. has followed. But there are so many similar passages that little is gained even if this should be proved not genuine.) *Ambrosiaster comm. ad Ephes.* iv. 11: Primi Presbyteri Episcopi appellabantur, ut, recedent eo, sequens ei succederet. Denique apud Ægyptum Presbyteri consignant, si præsens non sit Episcopus. Sed quia cœperunt sequentes Presbyteri indigni inveniri ad primatus tenendos, immutata est ratio, prospiciente Concilio; ut non ordo, sed meritum crearet Episcopum multorum sacerdotum judicio constitutum, ne indignus temere usurparet, et esset multis scandalum. — *Pseudo-Augustini* (according to the conjecture of the Benedictines, *Hilarii Diaconi*) *Quæstiones Vet. et Nov.*

was appropriated to this first Presbyter.[3] Hence the different accounts of the order of the first bishops in the church at Rome. The oldest authorities (Irenæus adv. hær. III. 3. Euseb. hist. eccl. III. 2, 13, 14, 31.) give them in the following order: *Linus*, (2 Tim. iv. 21?) † A. D. 80; *Anencletus*, *Anacletus*, or *Cletus* † A. D. 92; *Clemens* (Philipp. iv. 3?) † A D. 102; *Evarestus* † A. D. 110; *Alexander* † 120.[4] — At Antioch, *Evodius*, *Ignatius*, *Heros*. — At Alexandria: (*Marcus*), *Annianus*, *Abilius*, *Cerdo*. — The promiscuous right to teach in the public assemblies having early led to improprieties (James iii. 1), it seems already, without being formally restricted, to have been confined by custom to those who held offices in the church.

Testamenti (in the Appendix Tom. III. P. II. of the Benedict. ed.) *Quæst.* 101: Presbyterum autem intelligi Episcopum probat Paulus Apostolus, quando Timotheum, quem ordinavit Presbyterum, instruit, qualem debeat creare Episcopum (1 *Tim.* iii. 1). Quid est enim Episcopus, nisi primus Presbyter, hoc est summus sacerdos? — Nam in Alexandria et per totam Ægyptum, si desit Episcopus, consecrat [*Ms. Colb.* consignat] Presbyter. In like manner, *Eutychius* (Said Ibn Batrik about 930) Patriarcha Alex. in Ecclesiæ suæ Origg. (ed. *Joh. Selden*, p. XXIX): Constituit Marcus Evangelista XII Presbyteros, qui nempe manerent cum Patriarcha, adeo ut cum vacaret Patriarchatus eligerent unum e XII Presbyteris, cujus capiti reliqui XI manus imponerent, eique benedicerent, et Patriarcham eum crearent (comp. 1 Tim. iv. 14). — Neque desiit Alexandriæ institutum hoc de Presbyteris, ut scilicet Patriarchas crearent ex Presbyteris duodecim, usque ad tempora Alexandri Patriarchæ Alexandrini qui fuit ex numero illo CCCXVIII. Is autem vetuit, ne deinceps Patriarcham Presbyteri crearent. Et decrevit, ut mortuo Patriarcha convenirent Episcopi, qui Patriarcham ordinarent. In this passage it is at least certain that the part which is contradictory to the usage of later times has not been interpolated, and so far it has an historical value. Attempts have been made to explain away its evidence by Morinus, Pearson, Le Quien, Renaudot, Petavius, and especially by *Abraham Echellensis* Eutychius Patriarcha Alex. vindicatus et suis restitutus Orientalibus, s. responsio ad Jo. Selderi Origines etc. Romæ. 1661. 4to. *Mamachii* Origg. et Antiquitt. Christian. Tom. IV. p. 503 seq. On the other hand, see *J. F. Rehkopf* Vitæ Patriarcharum Alexandr. fasc. I. et II.

[3] *Clemens Rom.* in epist. I. ad Corinth. § 42, names only ἐπίσκοποι καὶ διάκονοι, *Polycarp.* ad Philipp. § 5, πρεσβύτεροι καὶ διάκονοι. — On the other hand, *Ignatius* in epist. ad Philadelph. § 7: τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ προσέχετε καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ καὶ διακόνοις et passim. — Even Irenæus calls the bishops presbyteri (adv. hær. IV. 26. V. 2; epist. ad Victorem ap. Euseb. h. e. V. 24).

[4] Comp. § 27, note 6. In the modern Catholic church the order of succession is, Peter, Linus, Clement, Cletus, Anacletus, Evarestus. Comp. Joh. Pearson's and Henr. Dodwell's dissertt. de successione primorum Romæ episcoporum in *Pearsonii* opp. posthum. Lond. 1688. 4to. — *J. Ph. Baraterii* disquisitio chronolog. de successione antiquissima episcoporum Romanorum. Ultraj. 1740. 4to.

§ 33.

APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

SS. Patrum, qui temporibus Apostolicis floruerunt, Opera ed. *J. B. Cotelerius.* Paris. 1672. recud. curavit *J. Clericus* ed. 2. Amst. 1724. 2 voll. fol. — SS. Patrum Apostolic. opera genuina ed. *Rich. Russell.* Lond. 1746. 2 voll. 8vo.

The Apostolic Fathers are those who are known with certainty to have been the immediate pupils of the Apostles, and more strictly those of them who are known to us as authors. Such are *Barnabas* (vid. § 26),[1] *Clement* of Rome,[2] to whom the *constitutiones*

---

[1] The epistle of Barnabas (declared to be genuine by Clement Alex., Origen, and Jerome) was wholly unknown till its publication by Hugo Menardus, Paris. 1645. 4to.: a previous edition by Usher, 1643, having been burned in the printing-office at Oxford. In the following year a corrected edition was appended by J. Vossius to his edition of Ignatius ep.: Amstel. 1646. For a long time the prevailing opinion was against its genuineness. See especially *Teutzel* ad Hieron. Catal. c. 6, in Fabricii bibl. eccles. p. 38 seq.; though Vossius, Cave, Grynæus, and Gallandius were on the other side. The more favorable opinion having been adopted by Schmidt K. G. Th. 1. S. 437; Münscher Dogmengesch. Bd. 1. S. 111, and Rosenmüller hist. interpret. libb. sacr. T. I. p. 42, it became almost the prevailing one, and was supported with great ingenuity particularly by *Henke* de epistolæ quæ Barnabæ tribuitur authentia. Jenæ. 1828. and *J. C. Roerdam* comm. de authentia epist. Barnabæ. Hafn. 1828. Still more recently the authenticity of this epistle has been questioned by several of the most important authorities, viz. Neander (Kirchengesch. Bd. 1. Abth. 3), Twesten (Dogmatik. Bd. 1. S. 104); Ullmann (Theol. Studien und Kritiken. Bd. 1. Heft. 2. S. 382), and Hug (Zeitschrift für die Furstl. etc. Heft. 2. S. 132 ff). — The chief argument against the genuineness of this epistle, namely, that the mode of interpretation therein pursued is too tasteless and mystic to be ascribed to a companion of Paul, seems hardly sufficient (vid. Bleek Brief an die Heb. Abth. 1. S. 416 ff). According to c. iv. and c. x., the epistle was written soon after the destruction of Jerusalem; and the testimony of Clement for its genuineness cannot be set aside on the ground of the partiality of the Alexandrians for the work of a kindred spirit, since the doctrine of the Millennium as therein contained (c. xv.) must have been distasteful to them, and all the interpretations are so far from satisfactory to Clement that he directly refutes one of them, Pædag. II. p. 291, and, Strom. II. p. 464, rejects the whole view taken by Barnabas of Ps. 1. 1.

[2] The authenticity of his epistle to the Corinthians, which was read in the public assemblies of Christians at Corinth, as early as the second century (according to Dionys. Cor. in Euseb. h. e. IV. 23, 6; Iren. III. 3), is called in question by Semler (Hist. Einleitung zu Baumgartens Unters. Theol. Streitigk. Bd. 2. S. 16) without sufficient ground. It has been defended by H. Bignom, Ed. Bernard, H. Barton. Jo. Clericus (vid. Patrum apost. Cotelerii ed. Clerici, II. p. 133, 478, 482, and in his notes to this epistle), Ittig, Mosheim, and Neander. The so called 2d epistle of Clement is not genuine (Euseb. III. 38). Both of these letters, contained only in the Cod. Alex., were first published by *Patric. Junius.* Oxon. 1633. 4to., and his incorrect text has been retained in most editions of them. A more correct text was published by *Henry Wotton.* Cantab. 1718, which has been adopted, however, only in the editions of *Russell, Gallandius,* (Bibl. PP. T. I), and *Schoenemann* (Pontiff. Roman. epistolæ genuinæ ex rec. P. Constantii. Gött. 1796. 8vo.) [Lard. Cred. P. II. vol. I. p. 283. Lond. 1815. — Tr.]

Apostolicæ in 8 books, *canones Apost.*,[3] and the *Clementines*,[4] have been falsely ascribed,] *Hermas*,[5] *Ignatius*,[6] and *Polycarp*, bishop of Smyrna († A. D. 167).[7] Of the works of *Papias*, bishop of Hierapolis,[8] only fragments are extant; the pretended works of *Dio-*

---

3 The Constitutiones Apostolicæ and Canones Apostolorum (best ed. in Cotelerii Patr. Apostol. vol. I.) are records of the supposed Apostolic customs of the time, in the form of Apostolic prescriptions (cf. Hier ep. 52 ad Lucianum: Unaquæque provincia abundet in sensu suo, et præcepta majorum leges Apostolicas arbitretur). The *Constitutiones Apostolicæ*, διατάξεις τῶν Ἀποστόλων, consist of 8 books, of which the first 6 or 7 were written, towards the end of the third century, in the East, and are probably the books cited by Eusebius h. e. III. c. 25, as διδαχαὶ τῶν Ἀποστόλων, by Athanasius in Ep. festali, and in Synopsi Sacræ Script. as διδαχὴ τ. Α., and by Epiphanius in various passages, as διατάξεις τ. Α. After the time of Epiphanius they must however have been much interpolated, and the 8th book added, comp. Krabbe über den Ursprung und den Inhalt d. apost. Constitutionen d. Clemens Rom. Hamb. 1829. Ueber d. apost. constit. in the Tübing. Theol. Quartelschrift. 1829. Heft. 3, S. 397 ff. — *Canones Apostolorum*, Κανόνες ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ τῶν ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων, are in the Greek church 85; the Latin church has adopted only the first 50, translated by Dionys. Exiguus. Every church rule, whether recorded or not, was at first called κανὼν ἀποστολικὸς (Alexander Ep. Alex. about A. D. 318 in Theodoret. h. e. I. 3); κανὼν (Conc. Nicæni Can. 5, 9); κανὼν ἐκκλησιαστικὸς (ibid. Can. 2. 10): the term was first used to denote a written code at the Conc. Constantinopol. A. D. 394. See *Krabbe* diss. de codice Canonum qui Apostolorum nomine circumferuntur. Gött. 1829. 4to. The ancient authorities on the Constitutiones and Canones are given in these two works of Krabbe.

4 See below § 41, note 5.

5 Ὁ ποιμήν, cited by Iren. IV. 3, as scriptura, and often cited by *Clemens Alex.* and others, claims (liber I. visio 2 in fine) to be the work of the Hermas mentioned Rom. xvi. 14. According to the fragm. de canone S. S. in *Muratori* antiquitt. italic. medii ævi T. III. diss. 43, p. 853, and the Pseudo-Tertullian. carm. contra Marcionitas, the author was a certain Hermas, brother of the bishop Pius I., though this is only conjecture; cf. *Dr. Gratz* disquisitionum in Pastorem Hermæ Part. I. Bonnæ. 1820. 4to.

6 Seven letters, ad Smyrnæos, ad Polycarpum, ad Ephesios, ad Magnesios, ad Philadelphienses, ad Trallianos, ad Romanos (the last cited by Irenæus 5, 28, and all seven named Euseb. III. 36) are still extant in two forms, a longer and a shorter; (the latter first published by Is. Vossius. Amstel. 1646. 4to.) The controversy concerning their genuineness was confounded with that concerning the origin of the episcopal power. It was defended by *Jo. Pearson* vindiciæ epistolarum S. Ignatii, Cantabr. 1672. 4to. On the other side, *Jo. Dallæus* de scriptis, quæ sub Dionysii Areopag. et Ignatii Antioch. nominibus circumferuntur. Genev. 1666. 4to. J. E. Ch. Schmidts Versuch über die gedoppelte Recension der Briefe des Ignatius, in Henkes Magazin für Religionsphilosophie &c. Bd. 3, S. 91. — Eight other pretended letters of Ignatius are without doubt spurious.

7 Epist. ad Philippenses, mentioned as early as Irenæus III. 3, (also by Eusebius IV. 14, 3), but nevertheless often called in question by those who were against the genuineness of the letters of Ignatius, — last by Semler and Rössler.

8 Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστὴς, Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἑταῖρος γεγονώς, Iren. V. 33, is supposed to have suffered martyrdom under M. Aurelius (Chronic. Alex. Olymp. 235, 3), and wrote λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις. Fragments in *Grabe* II. p. 26; *Routh* I. p. 1. — The manner in which he inculcates the doctrine of the Millennium led Eusebius h. e. III. 39, to judge him very harshly: χιλιάδα τινὰ φησὶν ἐτῶν ἔσεσθαι μετὰ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν, σωματικῶς τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ βασιλείας ἐπὶ ταυτησὶ τῆς γῆς ὑποστησομένης — — σφόδρα γάρ τοι σμικρὸς ὢν τὸν νοῦν — — σλὴν καὶ τοῖς μετ' αὐτὸν πλείστοις ὅσοις τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν τῆς ὁμοίας αὐτῷ δόξης παραίτιος γέγονε —

nysius the Areopagite,[9] cannot have been written before the fifth century.

§ 34.

HERETICS.

As Paul had foreseen (Acts xx. 29; 2 Tim. iii. 1 seq.), the faith of the Christians came now more than ever into peril from the influence of the sophistical religious speculations of the time; and the germs of Christian Gnosticism, allusions to which may be traced in his epistles, became more and more evident.[1] The history of the *Nicolaites*[2] is still very obscure, but the doctrines of the *Docetæ* are plainly the application of a familiar notion to the person of Jesus (Docetæ, Phantasiastæ, Opinarii).[3] Especially interesting however were the questions

— *ὥσπερ οὖν* Εἰρηναίῳ *κ. τ. λ.* How far Eusebius is justified in declaring him to have been only a pupil of a certain Presbyter John, when in his Chronicon (Olymp. 220) he had without question allowed that he was a scholar of the Apostle John, is examined by Olshausen die Echtheit der vier kanon. Evangelien. Königsb. 1823. S. 224 ff.

[9] Act. xvii. 34. According to Dionys. Corinth. ap. Euseb. III. 4. IV. 23., first Bishop of Athens. Of the writings spuriously ascribed to him (de hierarchia cœlesti, de hierarchia ecclesiastica, de nominibus divinis, de theologia mystica, epistolæ. ed. Paris. 1644. 2 voll. fol.), found first in the Collatio Catholicorum cum Severianis (cf. *Mansi* VIII. p. 817) A. D. 531, where they are appealed to by the Monophysites, it was said, as early as by Hypatius, Archbishop of Ephesus, ostendi non posse, ista vera esse, quæ nullus antiquus memoraverit. Comp. *Dallæus* as cited note 6. *I. G. V. Engelhardt* diss. de Dionysio Plotinizante. Erlang. 1820. 8vo. *Id.* de origine scriptorum Areopagiticorum. Erl. 1823. 8vo. *L. F. O. Baumgarten-Crusius* de Dionysio Areopagita comm. (Jenaisches Osterprogr. 1823, reprinted in Commentationes theolog. edd. *Rosenmüller*, *Fuldner* et *Maurer*. T. I. P. II. p. 268 seq.)

[1] Though this has been carried quite too far by *Henr. Hammond* diss. de Antichristo (in his Diss. IV. quibus episcopatus jura etc. adstruuntur. Lond. 1651), and the annotationes ad Nov. Test. (transtulit *J. Clericus*. Amst. 1698. fol.) — On the other extreme is *C. Chr. Tittmann* tract. de vestigiis Gnosticorum in N. T. frustra quæsitis. Lips. 1773. 8vo. — Joh. Horn über die biblische Gnosis. Hannover. 1805. 8vo.

[2] Apoc. ii. 6, 14, 15. *ἔχεις ἐκεῖ κρατοῦντας τὴν διδαχὴν* Βαλαὰμ — — *οὕτως ἔχεις καὶ σὺ κρατοῦντας τὴν διδαχὴν τῶν* Νικολαϊτῶν, *ὃ μισῶ.* Formerly the name was supposed to be derived from the *Nicolaus* Acts vi. 5, whom *Clemens Alex.*, Strom. II. p. 490, III. p. 522, represents as the innocent cause (from the misinterpretation of the words *ὅτι παραχρήσασθαι τῇ σαρκὶ δεῖ*); *Irenæus* I. 26, III. 11, and *Tertullian* (de præscript. hær. c. 46), however, as the founder of the sect. — The modern derivation is from *νικᾶν τὸν λαόν.* Nicolaites i. e. Balaamites (בלעם from בלע עם). So first *Christ. Aug. Heumann* in Actis Erudit. Lipsiens. ann. 1712, p. 179, ejusd. Pœcile T. II. p. 392. *J. C. Eichhorn* commentar. in Apocalypsin (voll. 2. Gotting. 1791.) vol. I. p. 74. Münscher einige Bermuthungen über die Nikolaiten, in Gablers Journal für theol. Literatur. Bd. 5. (1803) S. 17 ff.

[3] Perhaps even 1 John iv. 2; 2 John 7; (vid. Lücke's Comm. zu Johannes, Th. 3. S. 62 ff.) Distinctly and often in Ignatius ad Ephes. 7, 18, ad Trallianos 9, 10, ad Smyrn. 1 – 8. Ἰησοῦν τὸ δοκεῖν (δοκήσει, φαντασίᾳ) πιστεύθηναι. cf. *Hieronymus adv. Luciferianos* (ed. Martian. Tom. IV. P. II. p. 304): Apostolis adhuc in

concerning the creation of the world and the origin of evil, with reference to the different character of the God of the Old Testament and the God of the Christians, and the different spirit of the law and the gospel: speculations to which John seems already to have reference in his Gospel, seeking to reconcile them, as well as might be, with Christianity. From these speculations sprung the first Gnostic system, that of *Cerinthus*, in which however the Gnostic principles are not yet fully and consistently developed, but in some respects accommodated to Jewish opinions.[4]

---

sæculo superstitibus, adhuc apud Judæam Christi sanguine recenti, phantasma Domini corpus asserebatur. — This was the Jewish notion of angels, *Tob.* xii. 19. — *Philo* de Abrah. p. 366: τεράστιον δὲ καὶ τὸ μὴ πεινῶντας πεινώντων, καὶ μὴ ἐσθίοντας ἐσθίοντων παρέχειν φαντασίαν. (Comp. Neanders gnostische Systeme. S. 23). *Josephus* Ant. I. 11, 2; V. 6, 2: φαντάσματος δ' αὐτῷ (Gideoni) παραστάντος νεανίσκου μορφῇ. The church-fathers have the same notion of angels. Comp. *Keilii* opuscula ed. Goldhorn (Lips. 1821), Sect. II. p. 548. — *H. A. Niemeyer* comm. de Docetis. Halæ. 1823. 4to.

[4] He teaches that between the God of the Jews (δημιουργός) and the Supreme is a series of Æons, and that the Supreme Being was first revealed by the Æon Christ. Still the Mosaic law is to be observed, and a resurrection and millennium to be expected. — See J. E. C. Schmidt Cerinth ein judaisirender Christ, in his Bibl. für Kritik und Exegese des N. T. Bd. 1. S. 181. — *H. E. G. Paulus* historia Cerinthi in his introductionis in N. T. capita selectiora. Jenæ. 1799. 8vo. Neander's Kirchengeschichte. Bd. 1. Abth. 2. S. 671 ff.

SECOND DIVISION.

FROM HADRIAN TO SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS. A. D. 117—193.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 35.

OF PAGANISM.

Vid. *P. E. Müller* de hierarchia et studio vitæ asceticæ in sacris et mysteriis Græcorum Romanorumque latentibus. Hafn. 1803. 8vo. (German in the N. Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften. Bd. 69. S. 207 ff.) [Tzschirner's Fall des Heidenthums. Bd. 1. p. 124–164. — Tr.]

In the period which we are now to describe, the Roman empire was at rest from foreign foes, and order and justice were steadfastly maintained by its rulers, but it was too late to hope for the restoration of ancient virtue and religious fidelity. The propensity to theosophic rites and mysteries (§ 14) led continually to new superstitions. Besides the wandering priests of Isis, the Gauls, Chaldeans, and Magicians, the Eleusinian and Dionysian mysteries were now revived (though probably accommodated in some respects to the spirit of the time), and various other secret rites (of the *Dea Syra*, of Isis, and of Mithras) were extending themselves over the whole empire. Abstinence from sensual pleasure was the universal condition of admittance, and by means of this the initiated were to advance, through the different grades of the mysteries, to nearer and nearer communion with the Gods. Men felt their want of religion, but sought it where it was not to be found, — in external observances. The prevailing philosophy continued to be that *Platonic Eclecticism*, which adopted and defended all kinds of superstitions, though still it had the merit of introducing a kind of Monotheism even into the popular views.[1] Among

---

[1] Comp. *Maximi Tyrii* diss. XVII. (al. I.) ex rec. J. Davisii. Lond. 1740. 4to. p. 193, with reference to the different opinions of mankind on religious subjects: Ἐν τοσούτῳ δὴ πολέμῳ, καὶ στάσει, καὶ διαφωνίᾳ, ἕνα ἴδοις ἂν ἐν πάσῃ γῇ ὁμόφωνον νόμον καὶ λόγον, ὅτι Θεὸς εἷς πάντων βασιλεὺς, καὶ πατὴρ, καὶ θεοὶ πολλοὶ, Θεοῦ παῖδες, συνάρχοντες Θεῷ. Ταῦτα δὲ ὁ Ἕλλην λέγει, καὶ ὁ βάρβαρος λέγει, καὶ ὁ ἠπειρώτης, καὶ ὁ θαλάττιος, καὶ ὁ σοφὸς, καὶ ὁ ἄσοφος· κἂν ἐπὶ τοῦ ὠκεανοῦ ἔλθῃς τὰς ἠϊόνας, κἀκεῖ θεοὶ, τοῖς μὲν ἀνίσχοντες ἀγχοῦ μάλα, τοῖς δὲ καταδυόμενοι. In this period, too, we often meet with the notion that the numerous Deities were only different names for the same being under different aspects. *Lobeck* Aglaophus. T. II. p. 460 seq. Something of the same kind may be gathered from the figuræ pantheæ, so common on ancient gems.

its disciples the most distinguished are *Plutarch of Chæronea* († A. D. 120), *Apuleius of Madaura* (about A. D. 170), and *Maximus of Tyre* (about A. D. 190). In opposition to this, the *Skeptic* philosophy was carried to new degrees of subtilty. *Sextus Empiricus.*

§ 36.

FATE OF THE JEWS.

Dio Cassius LXVIII. c. 32; LXIX. c. 12-14. *Euseb. hist. eccl.* IV. c. 2 et 6. — F. Münter der jüd. Krieg unter den Kaisern Trajan und Hadrian. Altona. 1821. 8vo. — Josts Geschichte der Israeliten. Th. 3. S. 181 ff. — [Milman's Hist. of the Jews. 3 vols. 12mo. — Tr.]

Their hatred of the Romans, embittered by the destruction of Jerusalem, and various acts of oppression that followed, soon broke out in new insurrections. The first of these was in *Cyrenaica* (A. D. 115), extending also throughout *Egypt*, and raged longest in *Cyprus.* Another broke out almost simultaneously in *Mesopotamia.* Some after-workings of these insurrections were felt as late as the time of Hadrian, and seem to have suggested to him the thought of doing away the distinguishing mark of the nation by prohibiting circumcision.[1] At the same time he sent a Roman colony to Jerusalem. In this extremity there appeared amongst the Jews a pretended Messiah, who, assuming the name of *Bar Cochba* (Numb. xxiv. 17)[2], collected many followers, chiefly through the influence of the Rabbi Akiba, and, establishing himself in the fortress Bitther, undertook to drive out the Romans from the land (A. D. 132). He had already extended his conquests beyond the borders of Syria, when Julius Severus appeared, and, after a bloody war, put an end to the insurrection by the taking of Bitther (A. D. 135). Palestine became a desert. On the ruins of Jerusalem rose the colony of Ælia Capitolina, where all entrance was prohibited to the Jews on pain of death. Hadrian's law against circumcision continued in force till the reign of Antoninus Pius.[3]

---

[1] *Spartianus in Hadriano*, c. 14. Moverunt ea tempestate et Judæi bellum quod vetabantur mutilare genitalia.

[2] After his failure called בר כוזיבא, *filius mendacii.*

[3] *Modestinus* JCtus (about A. D. 244) in *Dig. Lib. XLVIII. Tit* 8. *l.* 11: Circumcidere Judæis filios suos tantum rescriptio Divi Pii permittitur: in non ejusdem religionis qui hoc fecerit, castrantis pœna irrogatur. *Ulpianus* in *Dig. Lib. L. Tit.* 2. *l.* 3, § 3: Eis, qui Judaicum superstitionem sequantur, D. Severus et Antoninus honores (namely, *decurionum*) adipisci permiserunt: sed et necessitates (*onera, functiones, et munera*) eis imposuerunt, quæ superstitionem eorum non læderent. — *Julius Paulus* (about 222) in his *sententiis receptis* (in *Schultingii* Jurisprudentia vetus antejustinianea and *Hugo* Jus civile antejustin. Tom. I.) *lib. V. Tit.* 22 *de seditiosis* 3: Cives Romani, qui se Judaico ritu vel servos suos circumcidi patiuntur, bonis ademptis in insulam perpetuo relegantur. Medici capite puniuntur. 4. Judæi si alienæ nationis comparatos servos circumciderint, aut deportantur aut capite puniuntur. The Samaritans also were forbidden to practise circumcision. *Origenes* c. Celsum II. c. 13, p. 68, ed. Spencer.

CHAPTER FIRST.

EXTERNAL HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY.

§ 37.

ITS PROGRESS.

Though evidently much exaggerated by the Christian writers of the day,[1] there can be no doubt that the progress of Christianity in this period was very extraordinary. In the West this progress was most remarkable in *Africa*, where Carthage was the chief seat of the new religion.[2] In *Gaul* we find churches at Lugdunum and Vienna soon after the middle of the second century (Euseb. V. c. 1); and from hence it may have been carried into *Germany* (Cisrhenana) and *Britain*. In the East we find Christianity established at *Edessa*, as early as the middle of the second century;[3] and from this city it seems to

---

[1] *Justin. dial. c. Tryph.* c. 117: οὐδὲ ἓν γὰρ ὅλως ἐστὶ τὸ γένος ἀνθρώπων, εἴτε βαρβάρων, εἴτε Ἑλλήνων, εἴτε ἁπλῶς ὡτινιοῦν ὀνόματι προσαγορευομένων, ἢ ἀμαξοβίων, ἢ ἀοίκων κελευομένων, ἢ ἐν σκηναῖς κτηνοτρόφων οἰκούντων, ἐν οἷς μὴ διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ σταυρωθέντος Ἰησοῦ εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαριστίαι τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ποιητῇ τῶν ὅλων γίνονται. *Irenæus*, I. 3: καὶ οὔτε αἱ ἐν Γερμανίαις ἱδρυμέναι ἐκκλησίαι ἄλλως πεπιστεύκασιν, ἢ ἄλλως παραδιδόασιν, οὔτε ἐν ταῖς Ἰβηρίαις, οὔτε ἐν Κελτοῖς, οὔτε κατὰ τὰς ἀνατολὰς, οὔτε ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, οὔτε ἐν Λιβύῃ, οὔτε αἱ κατὰ μέσα τοῦ κόσμου ἱδρυμέναι. *Tertullianus adv. Judæos*, c. 7: In quem enim alium universæ gentes crediderunt nisi in Christum, qui jam venit? Cui enim et aliæ gentes crediderunt: Parthi, Medi, Elamitæ, et qui inhabitant Mesopotamiam, Armeniam, Phrygiam, Cappadociam, et incolentes Pontum et Asiam, Pamphyliam, immorantes Ægyptum et regionem Africæ, quæ est trans Cyrenen, inhabitantes Romam, et incolæ tunc et in Hierusalem Judæi et cæteræ gentes (thus far taken from Act. ii. 9, 10): etiam Getulorum varietates, et Maurorum multi fines, Hispaniarum omnes termini, et Galliarum diversæ nationes, et Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo vero subdita, et Sarmatarum et Dacorum et Germanorum et Scytharum et abditarum multarum gentium, et provinciarum et insularum multarum, nobis ignotarum: et quæ enumerare minus possumus. In the Roman empire: *Tertulliani Apologet.* c. 37: Si enim hostes exertos, non tantum vindices occultos agere vellemus, deesset nobis vis numerorum et copiarum? Plures nimirum Mauri et Marcomanni ipsique Parthi, vel quantæcunque unius tamen loci et suorum finium gentes, quam totius orbis? Hesterni sumus, et vestra omnia implevimus, urbes, insulas, castella, municipia, conciliabula, castra ipsa, tribus, decurias, palatium, senatum, forum. *Iren.* IV. 49, mentions — fideles, qui in regali aula sunt et ex iis, quæ Cæsaris sunt, haben utensilia.

[2] *Fr. Muenteri* primordia Eccl. Africanæ. Hafn. 1829. 4to. p. 6. The numbers of the Christians in Carthage may be inferred from *Tertulliani apologet.* c. 37, (see preceding note,) and *adv. Scapulam.* c. 5, where he says that to extirpate the Christians would be to decimate Carthage. About the year 200 a synod was held at Carthage under Agrippinus, the bishop, (*Cyprian.* Ep. 71 and 73,) which, according to *Augustin. de baptismo*, II. c. 13, consisted of 70 African and Numidian bishops.

[3] The Christian *Bardesanes*, about 160 – 170, was held in high respect by the prince of Edessa, *Abgar Bar Manu.* — According to the Chronicon of Edessa in

have been carried into the countries lying farther eastward.[4] About the year 190, Pantænus went from Alexandria to preach the gospel in *India*.[5] (Euseb. h. e. V. 10.)

§ 38.

POPULAR DISPOSITION TOWARDS CHRISTIANITY.

As the peculiarities of Christianity became better known, it must of course have seemed to the Heathen highly dangerous in its tendency. The Christians held the Heathen Gods for evil demons, and, as the worship of the Gods pervaded every thing, they were forced to withdraw entirely from intercourse with those around them.[1] This gave their religion the aspect of a *misanthropic superstition*.[2] But, besides this, the Christians refused to pay the usual honors to the emperors,[3] cherished avowedly the expectation that all the kingdoms of the earth were soon to be destroyed,[4] and often refused the civil and military

---

Assemanni Orient. Biblioth. (Auszug von A. F. Pfeiffer. Erlang. 1776. S. 129), the church of the Christians at Edessa was destroyed by an inundation, as early as A. D. 202. Comp. *Bayer* historia Osrhoena et Edessena. Petrop. 1734. 4to. p. 173.

4 *Bardesanes* de fato (in *Eusebii* Præpar. evang. VI. c. 10): οὔτε οἱ ἐν Παρθίᾳ Χριστιανοὶ πολυγαμοῦσι, Πάρθοι ὑπάρχοντες, οὔθ' οἱ ἐν Μηδίᾳ κυσὶ παραβάλλουσι τοὺς νεκρούς· οὐχ οἱ ἐν Περσίδι γαμοῦσι κὰς θυγατέρας αὐτῶν, Πέρσαι ὄντες· οὐ παρὰ Βάκτροις καὶ Γάλλοις φθείρουσι τοὺς γάμους· οὐχ οἱ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ θρησκεύουσι τὸν Ἄπιν, ἢ τὸν Κύνα, ἢ τὸν Τράγον, ἢ Αἴλουρον. Ἀλλ' ὅπου εἰσὶν, οὔτε ὑπὸ τῶν κακῶς κειμένων νόμων, καὶ ἐθῶν νικῶνται.

5 Probably in Arabia. Comp. above § 27. p. 54.

1 For instance, from the theatres (cf. *Tertulliani* de spectaculis liber), from festivals and banquets (even the wearing of chaplets was not allowed amongst them. *Tertull.* de corona militis. *Clemens Alex.* in Pædagogo II. c. 8.), from certain arts, etc. cf. *Tertullian.* de idololatria liber. Neander's Antignosticus. Berlin. 1825. Kirchengeschichte. Bd. 1. Abth. 2. S. 436 ff.

2 *Minucii Felicis* Octavius. c. 12, the Heathen Cecilius says: Vos vero suspensi interim atque solliciti honestis voluptatibus abstinetis: non spectacula visitis, non pompis interestis: convivia publica absque vobis; sacra certamina, præceptos cibos et delibatos altaribus potus abhorretis. Sic reformidatis Deos, quos negatis. Non floribus caput nectitis, non corpus odoribus honestatis: reservatis unguenta funeribus, coronas etiam sepulcris denegatis, pallidi, trepidi, misericordia digni et nostrorum Deorum. c. 8: latebrosa et lucifuga natio, in publicum muta, in angulis garrula.

3 Thus *Tertull.* de idololatr. c. 13–15, opposes the illumination and decoration of the doors in honor of the emperors. cf. c. 15: Igitur quod attineat ad honores regum vel imperatorum, satis præscriptum habemus, in omni obsequio esse nos oportere, secundum Apostoli præceptum, subditos magistratibus, et principibus et magistratibus: sed intra limites disciplinæ, quousque ab idololatria separamur. — Accendant igitur quotidie lucernas, quibus lux nulla est; adfigant postibus lauros postmodum arsuras, quibus ignes imminent: illis competunt et testimonia tenebrarum, et auspicia pœnarum. Tu lumen es mundi, et arbor virens semper. Si templis renuntiasti, ne feceris templum januam tuam.

4 How this was understood by the Heathen, vid. *Justini* Apol. I. c. 11: καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀκούσαντες βασιλείαν προσδοκῶντας ἡμᾶς, ἀκρίτως ἀνθρώπινον λέγειν ἡμᾶς ὑπειλήφατε, ἡμῶν τὴν μετὰ θεοῦ λεγόντων.

offices which were offered them.[5] It was natural that these should have been deemed sufficient proofs of the tendency of their religion to make men bad citizens. Nor was it of much use for them to assert, with whatever justice, that it only bound them the more strongly to obey the public authorities;[6] since it must always have seemed to the Heathen (with their views of the subordination of religion to politics) but a doubtful sort of obedience, which was promised only on condition that the laws of men should not be opposed to the laws of God.[7] The elevated views of the Divine Nature revealed by Christianity could not fail of their influence on the unprejudiced amongst the Heathen;[8] but then some of them maintained that these same views were taught in their philosophy;* others were repelled by the positive doctrines of Christianity;[9] whilst others suffered themselves to be misled by the absurd stories, the offspring of hatred and ignorance, which had been circulated concerning the object of Christian worship.[10] The *brotherly love*, too, of the Christians, whilst it undoubt-

---

5 See especially *Tertull.* de idolol. c. 17, 18. *Idem* de corona militis, c. 11. *Origen.* c. Celsum VIII. p. 427. Still there were many Christian soldiers in this age. *Neander's* Hist. of the Church. vol. I. p. 299. Lond. 1831. 8vo.

6 *Epist. Eccl. Smyrn.* ap. Euseb. IV. c. 15, § 9. *Justinus M.* Apol. I. c. 17. *Irenæus*, V. c. 24. *Theophil. Antioch.* ad Autolycum I. c. 11.

7 *Tertull.* ad Scapulam, c. 2: Circa majestatem Imperatoris infamamur. — Christianus nullius est hostis, nedum imperatoris; quem sciens a Deo suo constitui, necesse est ut et ipsum diligat, et revereatur, et honoret, et salvum velit cum toto Romano imperio, quousque sæculum stabit. Tamdiu enim stabit. Colimus ergo et imperatorem sic, quomodo et nobis licet, et ipsi expedit, ut hominem a Deo secundum, et quicquid est, a Deo consecutum, solo Deo minorem. *Idem contra Gnosticos*, c. 14: Condixerat scilicet Petrus, regem quidem honorandum, ut tamen tunc rex honoretur, cum suis rebus insistit, cum a divinis honoribus longe est. See above, note 3.

8 *Tertull.* adv. Marcion. I. c. 10: Animæ enim a primordio conscientia Dei dos est: eadem nec alia et in Ægyptiis, et in Syria, et in Ponticis. Judæorum enim Deum dicunt animæ Deum. — Habet Deus testimonia totum hoc quod sumus, et in quo sumus.

* So Celsus often (*Orig.* c. Cels. V. p. 274; VI. p. 275; VII. p. 370). *Tertull.* Apologet. c. 46.

9 Objections brought by the Heathen; *Arnobius* I. c. 36: Sed non iccirco Dii vobis infesti sunt, quod omnipotentem colatis Deum: sed quod hominem natum, et, quod personis infame est vilibus, crucis supplicio interemptum, et Deum fuisse contenditis, et superesse adhuc creditis, et quotidianis supplicationibus adoratis. The doctrine of the resurrection and the last judgment was particularly offensive. Comp. *Celsus* (*Teller* fides dogmatis de resurrect. carnis per IV priora secula. Halæ. 1766. 8vo. p. 270.) *Tertull.* Apologet. c. 18: Hæc et nos risimus aliquando. De vestris fumus: fiunt, non nascuntur Christiani.

10 *Tertulliani* Apologet. c. 16: Somniastis, caput asininum esse Deum nostrum; — crucis nos religiosos. — Alii plane humanius et verisimilius solem credunt deum nostrum — Sed nova jam Dei nostri in ista civitate proxime editio publicata est, (namely) pictura cum ejusmodi inscriptione: *Deus Christianorum Onochoitis* (s. *Onochoites*, *Ononychites*, etc.) Is erat auribus asininis, altero pede ungulatus, librum gestans, et togatus. *Minucius Felix*, c. 9. See note 12. Comp. § 16, note 6. Other fictions concerning the person of Jesus are referred to by *Origen.* c. Celsum, I. p. 22 seq. On the other hand, the superstitious argued from the oppressed situation of the Christians the impotence of their God. So the Heathen Cæcilius in *Minucius Felix*, c. 12. Others objected to the foreign

edly attracted many to their religion (though sometimes also it proved a bait to low and calculating selfishness),[11] was susceptible of misinterpretation, and the more so on account of the secrecy of their meetings.[12] And even the *constancy of the martyrs*, though it ought certainly to have led every unprejudiced mind to inquire what it was that could supply so lofty a spirit,[13] also became a ground of dislike.[14]

---

origin of Christianity, (thus Celsus calls it βάρβαρον δόγμα. *Orig.* c. Cels. I. p. 5), or to the humble character of most of those who professed it (Cæcilius in *Minucius Felix*, c. 5 and 12), and all to the notion of one religion for all nations. (*Orig.* c. Cels. VIII. p. 425.)

[11] *Lucianus* de morte Peregrini, c. 11 – 16.

[12] *Tertull.* Apologet. c. 39: Sed ejusmodi vel maxime dilectionis operatio notam nobis inurit penes quosdam. *Vide*, inquiunt, *ut invicem se diligant:* ipsi enim invicem oderunt: *et ut pro alterutro mori sint parati:* ipsi enim ad occidendum alterutrum paratiores. Sed et quod fratrum appellatione censemur, — infamant. The Heathen Octavius, in *Minucius Felix*, c. 9: Occultis se notis et insignibus noscunt, et amant mutuo pæne ante quam noverint: passim etiam inter eos velut quædam libidinum religio miscetur; ac se promiscue appellant fratres et sorores, ut etiam non insolens stuprum, intercessione sacri nominis, fiat incestum. Ita eorum vana et demens superstitio sceleribus gloriatur. Nec de ipsis, nisi subsisteret veritas, maxime nefaria et honore præfanda sagax fama loqueretur. Audio, eos turpissimæ pecudis, caput asini consecratum inepta nescio qua persuasione venerari: digna et nata religio talibus moribus. Alii eos ferunt ipsius antistitis ac sacerdotis colere genitalia, et quasi parentis sui adorare naturam: nescio an falsa, certe occultis ac nocturnis sacris apposita suspicio: et qui hominem, summo supplicio pro facinore punitum, et crucis ligna feralia, eorum cærimonias fabulatur, congruentia perditis sceleratisque tribuit altaria, ut id colant, quod merentur. Jam de initiandis tirunculis fabula tam detestanda, quam nota, est. Infans farre contectus, ut decipiat incautos, apponitur ei, qui sacris imbuitur. Is infans a tirunculo, farris superficie quasi ad innoxios ictus provocato, cæcis occultisque vulneribus occiditur: hujus (proh nefas!) sitienter sanguinem lambunt: hujus certatim membra discerpunt: hac fœderantur hostia. — Et de convivio notum est, (passim omnes loquuntur,) id etiam Cirtensis nostri testatur oratio: ad epulas solemni die coëunt, cum omnibus liberis, sororibus, matribus, sexus omnis homines et omnis ætatis. Illic post multas epulas, ubi convivium caluit, et incestæ libidinis fervor ebrietate exarsit, canis, qui candelabro nexus est, jactu offulæ ultra spatium lineæ, qua vinctus est, ad impetum et saltum provocatur: sic everso et exstincto conscio lumine impudentibus tenebris nexus infandæ cupiditatis involvunt per incertum sortis etc. According to *Athenagoras* Apol. c. 4, three charges chiefly were brought against the Christians: ἀθεότητα, Θυέστειαν δεῖπνα, and Οἰδιποδείους μίξεις.

[13] *Tertull.* Apologeticus, c. 50: Nec quicquam tamen proficit exquisitior quæque crudelitas vestra, illecebra est magis sectæ; plures efficimur, quoties metimur a vobis: semen est sanguis Christianorum. — Illa ipsa obstinatio, quam exprobratis, magistra est. Quis enim non contemplatione ejus concutitur ad requirendum, quid intus in re sit? Quis non, ubi requisivit, accedit? ubi accessit, pati exoptat?

[14] *Arrianus* comm. de Epicteti disputationibus, IV. c. 7: εἶτα ὑπὸ μανίας μὲν δύναται τὶς οὕτω διατεθῆναι πρὸς ταῦτα (θάνατον κ. τ. λ.) καὶ ὑπὸ ἔθους ὡς οἱ Γαλιλαῖοι, ὑπὸ λόγου δὲ καὶ ἀποδείξεως οὐδεὶς δύναται; *Schweighäuser* in his edition, P. II. p. 915, holds the words ὡς οἱ Γαλ. to be a gloss. *Marc. Aurel.* εἰς ἑαυτόν, XI. c. 3: Οἷα ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχὴ ἡ ἕτοιμος, ἐὰν ἤδη ἀπολυθῆναι δέῃ τοῦ σώματος, καὶ ἤτοι σβεσθῆναι ἢ σκεδασθῆναι, ἢ συμμεῖναι; τὸ δὲ ἕτοιμον τοῦτο, ἵνα ἀπὸ ἰδικῆς κρίσεως ἔρχηται, μὴ κατὰ ψιλὴν παράταξιν, ὡς οἱ Χριστιανοί, ἀλλὰ λελογισμένως, καὶ σεμνῶς, καὶ ὥστε καὶ ἄλλον πεῖσαι, ἀπραγμόνως. *Eichstädt* also (Exercit. Antoniniana III.) conjectures that the words ὡς οἱ Χρ. were interpolated.

The Jews, though equally hated, were still in some degree protected by the regard paid to every thing national ;[15] but the Christians were looked upon as a band of ignorant and wild fanatics, who would gladly overturn the whole established order of things, if they could. The higher classes smiled at the fervor of their faith ; whilst the people hated them for despising the Gods, and considered every public calamity as a new warning from Heaven to exterminate this impious sect.[16]

§ 39.

OPPOSITION OF THE PHILOSOPHERS TO CHRISTIANITY.

The chief opposer of Christianity at this particular period was the Platonic philosopher *Celsus* (after A. D. 150), who in a work called *ἀληθὴς λόγος*, and perhaps in others since lost, collected all that could be said against it with a shadow of plausibility.[1] The Cynic philosopher *Crescens*, and the rhetorician *M. Cornelius Fronto* (about A. D. 150), are known as the opposers of Christianity only by a few detached passages.[2] *Lucian of Samosata* (about A. D. 180) only notices Christianity as one of the follies of the time.[3]

---

15 *Celsus* ap. *Origen. contra Celsum*, Lib. V. p. 247, 259 : *εἰ μὲν δὴ κατὰ ταῦτα περιιστέλλοιεν Ἰουδαῖοι τὸν ἴδιον νόμον · οὐ μεμπτὰ αὐτῶν, ἐκείνων δὲ μᾶλλον, τῶν καταλιπόντων τὰ σφέτερα, καὶ τὰ Ἰουδαίων προσποιουμένων.*

16 *Tertull.* Apologet. c. 40 : Existimant omnis publicæ cladis, omnis popularis incommodi Christianos esse causam. Si Tiberis ascendit in mœnia, si Nilus non ascendit in arva, si cœlum stetit, si terra movit, si fames, si lues, statim: *Christianos ad leonem.*

1 Celsus and his work are known only from the Reply of Origen (cont. Celsum libb. VIII. ed. *G. Spencer.* Cantab. 1677. 4to.) Origen calls him an Epicurean philosopher (I. p. 8 : *εὑρίσκεται ἐξ ἄλλων συγγραμμάτων Ἐπικούρειος ὤν*), who kept back his Epicurism in his work (IV. p. 165), and assumed the character of a Platonist (IV. p. 219 : *ἐν πολλοῖς Πλατωνίζειν θέλει*), undoubtedly because he could in this way best work upon the religious amongst the Heathen. Since Mosheim, it has been usual to think Celsus a Platonist, but this opinion has been satisfactorily shown to be incorrect by *J. F. Fenger* de Celso, Christianorum adversario, Epicureo, comm. Havn. 1828. 8vo, and Tzschirner, Fall des Heidenthums. Bd. I. S. 325. — According to Origen (I. p. 8), Celsus lived *κατὰ Ἀδριανὸν καὶ κατωτέρω.* It is certain that he wrote in the last half of the 2d century, for he recognises the various Gnostic sects, and even the Marcionites (V. p. 272), as parties already in existence. Probably he is the same Celsus, to whom Lucian dedicates his *Alexander*, as is supposed by the Scholiast (see *Luciani* Alexander, ed. C. G. Jacob. Colon. 1828. p. 3. *Fenger* l. c. p. 40 seq.) Origen is doubtful whether he is the same Celsus, who wrote various books against magic, and two other books against the Christians (I. p. 53; IV. p. 186.)

2 Concerning *Crescens* cf. Euseb. IV. 16, where also may be found the passages *Justin.* Apol. II. c. 3 ; *Tatian.* orat. c. 19. — Concerning *Fronto* cf. *Minucii Fel.* Octavius c. 9 (comp. § 38, note 12), and c. 31.

3 Vid. de morte Peregrini c. 11 - 16 ; Alexander c. 25, 38 ; de vera historia I. 12, 30 ; II. 4, 11, 12 ; cf. *Walchii* rerum Christianarum apud Lucian. de morte Peregr. explicatio, in the *Novi Commentarii Soc. Reg. Scient. Gotting. Tom. VIII. Commentatt. hist. et philol.* p. 1 seq. ; Tzschirners Geschichte der

§ 40.

PERSECUTIONS.

The laws against *religiones peregrinæ* and *collegia illicita* were still valid, and considered applicable to the Christians,[1] but were by no means universally and uniformly enforced. The persecutions to which they were exposed during this period were on the contrary partial; the effect of some popular fury, which the magistrates were unable to control, or else of the personal enmity of individuals. Consequently they were confined in every instance to a single city or province. In the reign of *Hadrian* (A. D. 117–138), the populace began to demand that the Christians should be put to death at the great festivals. But, at the representation of Serenius Granianus, proconsul of Asia Minor, Hadrian issued a rescript forbidding all such tumultuous conduct.[2] The tradition that Hadrian caused temples to be erected for the worship of Christ is the more improbable, that this emperor is known to have entertained very incorrect and unfavorable opinions of the Christians.[3] Under *Antoninus Pius* (A. D. 138–

Apologetik, Th. 1. S. 200 ff.; Lucianus num scriptis suis adjuvare religionem christianam voluerit diss. scrips. *H. C. A. Eichstädt.* Jenæ. 1820. 4to., reprinted in Luciani opp. ed. *J. Th. Lehmann*, T. I. p. LXXV. seq. (Lips. 1822).—The dialogue *Philopatris*, according to *J. M. Gesneri* de ætate et auctore Dialogi Lucianei qui Philopatris inscribitur, disputatio, (Jen. 1714. ed. 3. Gotting. 1741: also in *J. F. Reitz's* ed. of Lucian, P. III. p. 708 seq.), was written in the time of Julian; but, according to *Niebuhr*, under the emperor Nicephorus Phocas, A. D. 908, in Constantinople (see Corporis Scriptt. hist. Byzant. Bonnensis, P. XI. Præf. p. ix.).

1 *Tertulliani Apologeticus*, c. 38: Inter licitas factiones sectam istam deputari oportebat, a qua nihil tale committitur, quale de illicitis factionibus timeri solet, etc.

2 Originally preserved in Latin *Justin. Mart.* Apol. I. c. 69, and translated into Greek by *Eusebius* (h. e. IV. 9). *Rufinus* (hist. eccl. IV. 9.) has probably preserved the Latin original (cf. *Alexii Symmachi Mazochii* disquisitio in Gallandii biblioth. vett. Patr. T. I. p. 728): *Exemplum epistolæ imperatoris Adriani ad Minucium Fundanum Proconsulem Asiæ:* Accepi literas ad me scriptas a decessore tuo Serenio Graniano clarissimo viro: et non placet mihi relationem silentio præterire, ne et innoxii perturbentur, et calumniatoribus latrocinandi tribuatur occasio. Itaque si evidenter provinciales huic petitioni suæ adesse valent adversum Christianos, ut pro tribunali eos in aliquo arguant, hoc eis exsequi non prohibeo: precibus autem in hoc solis et acclamationibus uti, eis non permitto. Etenim multo æquius est, si quis volet accusare, te cognoscere de objectis. Si quis igitur accusat, et probat adversum leges quidquam agere memoratos homines, pro merito peccatorum etiam supplicia statues. Illud mehercle magnopere curabis, ut, si quis calumniæ gratia quemquam horum postulaverit reum, in hunc pro sui nequitia suppliciis severioribus vindices. Cf. *F. Balduinus* ad edicta vett. Princip. Rom. de Christianis, p. 72.

3 *Lampridius in vita Alexandri Severi*, c. 43: Christo templum facere voluit, eumque inter Deos recipere. Quod et Adrianus cogitasse fertur, qui templa in omnibus civitatibus sine simulacris jusserat fieri, quæ hodie idcirco, quia non habent numina, dicuntur Adriani, quæ ille ad hoc parasse dicebatur. On the other hand, *Spartianus in vita Hadriani*, c. 22: Sacra Romana diligentissime curavit, peregrina contempsit.—*Flav. Vopiscus in vita Saturnini*, c. 8, from a

161) they were again occasionally disturbed.[4] But far more unpropitious for the Christians was the reign of *Marcus Aurelius* (A. D. 161–180), the popular fury being continually excited against them by the repeated misfortunes that befell the empire, whilst the emperor himself was earnestly bent on upholding the ancient religion.[5] Hence the persecutions in Asia Minor,[6] to which Polycarp fell a sacrifice (A. D. 169).[7] Nearly at the same time Justin was put to death at Rome (A. D. 165).[8] The greatest sufferers, however, were the

---

work of *Phlegon*, a freedman of Hadrian: Hadrianus Augustus Serviano Cs. S. Ægyptum, quam mihi laudabas, Serviane carissime, totam didici, levem, pendulam, et ad omnia famæ momenta volitantem. Illi qui Serapin colunt, Christiani sunt, et devoti sunt Serapi, qui se Christi episcopos dicunt. Nemo illic archisynagogus Judæorum, nemo Samarites, nemo Christianorum presbyter, non mathematicus, non haruspex, non aliptes. Ipse ille patriarcha cum Ægyptum venerit, ab aliis Serapidem adorare, ab aliis cogitur Christum. — — Unus illis Deus nullus est. Hunc Christiani, hunc Judæi, hunc omnes venerantur et gentes etc.

4 Vid. *Dionysius Corinth.* ap. Euseb. IV. 53, concerning a persecution in Athens, in which the bishop Publius, the predecessor of Quadratus, suffered. *Melito* in Apolog. ad Marc. Aurel. ap. Euseb. IV. c. 26, § 5: *ὁ δὲ πατήρ σου — παῖς πόλεσι περὶ τοῦ μηδὲν νεωτερίζειν περὶ ἡμῶν ἔγραψεν· ἐν αἷς καὶ πρὸς Λαρισσαίους, καὶ πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς καὶ Ἀθηναίους, καὶ πρὸς πάντας Ἕλληνας.* This rescript of Antoninus may perhaps have been the foundation of the spurious *Edictum ad Commune Asiæ*, appended by a later hand to *Justini* Apol. I. c. 70, and cited by *Euseb.* IV. c. 13, with a reference to Melito (probably to the passage just given, which he misunderstood). All that could be said with any appearance of plausibility in favor of the genuineness of that edict has been said by *T. G. Hegelmaier* comm. in Edictum Imp. Ant. P. pro Christianis. Tubing. 1767. 4to. That it is not genuine has been shown by J. J. Scaliger, Moyle, Thirlby, and most convincingly by *Is. Huffner* de Edicto A. P. pro Christianis ad Commune Asiæ. Argentor. 1781. 4to. [Vid. Milner, Cent. II. ch. 2; Murdock's Mosheim, Vol. I. p. 137, note. — Tr.]

5 *Modestinus* (Dig. Lib. XLVIII. Tit. 19. L. 30): Si quis aliquid fecerit, quo leves hominum animi superstitione numinis terrentur, Divus Marcus hujusmodi homines in insulam relegari rescripsit. *Julii Pauli sententt. receptt. Lib.* V. *Tit.* 21, § 2: Qui novas, et usu vel ratione incognitas religiones inducunt, ex quibus animi hominum moveantur, honestiores deportantur, humiliores capite puniuntur. On the religious opinions of Marcus Aurelius and his sentiments towards the Christians, see Neander's Kirchengesch. Bd. 1. Abth. 1. S. 154 ff.

6 *Melito* in Apolog. ad Marc. Aurel. ap. Euseb. IV. 26: *τὸ γὰρ οὐδὲ πώποτε γενόμενον, νῦν διώκεται τὸ τῶν θεοσεβῶν γένος, καινοῖς ἐλαυνόμενον δόγμασι κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν· οἱ γὰρ ἀναιδεῖς συκοφάνται καὶ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων ἐρασταὶ, τὴν ἐκ τῶν διαταγμάτων ἔχοντες ἀφορμὴν, φανερῶς λῃστεύουσι, νύκτωρ καὶ μεθημέραν διαρπάζοντες τοὺς μηδὲν ἀδικοῦντας. — εἰ δὲ καὶ παρὰ σοῦ μὴ εἴη ἡ βουλὴ αὕτη καὶ τὸ καινὸν τοῦτο διάταγμα, — δεόμεθά σου, μὴ περιιδεῖν ἡμᾶς ἐν τοιαύτῃ δημώδει λεηλασίᾳ.* The law against the Christians in the Acta Symphoriani can hardly have been passed by M. Aurelius (as Neander supposes, l. c. p. 161), both on account of the inscription, omnibus administratoribus suis atque rectoribus, and the empty rhetoric at the close.

7 Ecclesiæ Smyrnensis de martyrio Polycarpi epistola encyclios, in *Euseb.* IV. c. 15, — first published by Usher, 1647, afterwards in Cotelerii Patr. Apost., and in Ruinart. For a comparative view of the two editions, see *Danz.* de Eusebio, p. 130 seq.

8 Acta Martyrii Justini Philos., in *Ruinart*, nova interpretatione, annotationibus, atque disquisitionibus illustrata ab *A. S. Mazochio* in *Gallandii* bibl. vett. Patr. T. I. p. 707 seq.

young churches at Lugdunum and Vienna (A. D. 177).[9] That the conduct of the emperor towards the Christians was changed by the supposed miracle of the Legio Melitina (A. D. 174) is hardly credible, as it was claimed by so many different parties.[10] Under the cruel Commodus (A. D. 180–192) the Christians were left unmolested.[11]

---

9 Ecclesiarum Viennensis et Lugdunensis epistola ad ecclesias Asiæ Phrygiæque de passione martyrum suorum, ap. *Euseb.* h. e. V. 1–3. The degree to which the Heathen were excited is shown (c. 1. § 6) in the transgression of the ancient law, de servo in dominum quæri non licere, *Cic. pro Dejot.* c. 1; *Tacit. Ann.* II. 30; *Digest.* Lib. XLVIII. Tit. 18, de quæstionibus.

10 The Heathen writers ascribe the phenomenon, partly to the arts of the Egyptian Arnuphis (*Dio Cassius* in excerpt. Xiphilini 71, 8. *Suidas* s. v. Ἰουλιανός), partly to the prayer of Marcus (*Capitolinus* in vita Marc. Aurel. c. 24. *Themistius* in orat. XV. p 191. edit. *Harduini*). cf. *Claudianus* de sexto Consulatu Honorii, v. 342. (Similar events are recounted of Alexander, *Curt.* IV. 7, 13. of Marius, *Orosii* hist. V. 15, and of Hosidius, *Dio Cass.* LX. § 9). The Christians, on the other hand, claimed the honor for their own party, cf. *Claudius Apollinaris* ap. *Euseb.* V. 5; *Tertulliani ad Scapul.* c. 4, and the above *Apologet.* c. 5. At nos e contrario edimus protectorem, si litteræ M. Aurelii — requirantur, quibus illam Germanicam sitim, Christianorum forte militum precationibus, impetrato imbri, discussam contestatur. Qui sicut non palam ab ejusmodi hominibus pœnam dimovit, ita alio modo palam dispersit, adjecta etiam accusatoribus damnatione, et quidem tetriore.

11 Marcia, the concubine of Commodus, favored the Christians (Dio Cassius, LXXII. 4). Concerning the martyrdom of Apollonius, see Euseb. h. e. V. 21; Hieron. Catal. c. 42. According to Jerome, he was betrayed by his slave Severus: according to Eusebius, his accuser was immediately put to death, ὅτι μὴ ζῆν ἐξὸν ἦν κατὰ βασιλικὸν ὅρον τοὺς τῶν τοιῶνδε μηνυτάς. *M. de Mandajors* (Histoire de l'Acad. des Inscript. Tom. 18, p. 221) is of opinion that the slave was put to death for accusing his master, by an old law which had been renewed by Trajan, but that the occurrence had been misunderstood by the Christians, and had given rise to the tradition, which we find in Tertullian, and in the spurious Edictum ad comm. Asiæ (see note 10), that one of the emperors had decreed the punishment of death for accusing a Christian. So also Neander Kirchengeschichte, Bd. 1. Abth. I. S. 180. It is true, that such a law against the denunciation of masters by slaves was passed under Nerva (*Dio. Cassius* LXVIII. p. 769. cf. *Capitolinus* in vita Pertinac. c. 9; *Digest.* Lib. XLIX. Tit. 14. L. 2. § 6): but, on the other hand, it was a law (see *Julius Paulus sententt. recept. Tit.* 16. § 4.), Servo, qui ultro aliquid de domino confitetur, fides non accommodatur (cf. *Digest.* Lib. XLVIII. Tit 18. L 1. § 5. and § 16; L. 9. § 1); and though cases of high treason were excepted from this, yet in such cases the punishment of the slave also was remitted, when the charge was proved (*Cod. Justinian.* Lib. IX. Tit 2. L. 20.) Comp. on all these laws *Gothofredus* in comm. ad Cod. Theodos. Lib. X. Tit. 10. c. 17; *J. A. Buchii* D. Trajanus sive de legibus Trajani Imp. Lips. 1747. 8vo. p 73 seq. According to these laws, therefore, either Apollonius or his slave only could have been put to death, and in no case both of them. But Jerome does not say, either that Severus was the slave of Apollonius, or that he was put to death; and, as Eusebius grounds his account of the matter expressly on a law proved to be spurious, it may be supposed that he took it from tradition, which had perhaps brought forward this instance in confirmation of the supposed law.

CHAPTER SECOND.

HERETICS.

§ 41.

JEWISH CHRISTIANS. (Comp. § 30).

Vid. Gieseler's Abhandlung von den Nazaräern und Ebioniten, in Stäudlin's und Tzschirner's Archiv. Bd. 4. St. 2.

Though the Jewish Christians had refused to join the seditious Bar Cochba (vid. § 36),[1] they did not escape the punishment inflicted on his followers, with whom they were naturally confounded. This led many of them to renounce Judaism entirely and join the church of Heathen converts, which had been gathered in Jerusalem.[2] The various sects of Jewish Christians continued, however, to exist down to the 4th century, and even later. The *Nazaræans*, who had established themselves near Pella in Decapolis, in Peræa, and at Beræa in Syria, were not as yet excluded from the church; though for their strict adherence to the Mosaic law they were looked upon as weak in the faith.[3] But, the connexion between them and the Gentile Christians becoming constantly less and less intimate, their tenets were less accurately understood; and, as they did not keep pace with the progress of doctrines, the actual difference between them and the church was greater and greater, till at length Epiphanius (about the year 400) includes them without qualification in his list of Heretics (Hær. XXIX.).

According to the same authority[4] the *Ebionites* and *Elkesaites*, both of which sects were found in the provinces beyond the Jordan and the Dead Sea, were afterwards united under the former name. The system of these new Ebionites is probably preserved in the Clementines.[5]

---

1 *Justin.* Apol. I. c. 31; *Euseb.* in Chronico; *Hieron.* Catal. c. 21.

2 *Euseb.* IV. 5, reckons till that time 15 bishops of Jerusalem ἐκ περιτομῆς. It is very possible that at the dispersion of the church there were several bishops at once. Ibid. c. 6. cf. *Sulpic. Sever.* hist. sacr. II. 31: Militum cohortem (Hadrianus) custodias in perpetuum agitare jussit, quæ Judæos omnes Hierosolymæ aditu arceret. Quod quidem Christianæ fidei proficiebat, quia tum pene omnes Christum Deum sub legis observatione credebant. Nimirum id Domino ordinante dispositum, ut legis servitus a libertate fidei atque ecclesiæ tolleretur. Ita tum primum Marcus ex gentilibus apud Hierosolymam episcopus fuit.

3 *Justin.* dial. cum Tryphone, c. 47.

4 *Epiphan.* hær. XIX. 5; XX. 3; XXX. 3, 17.

5 The Clementina, consisting of 3 prologues and 20 (19 only extant) homilies, and the Recognitiones Clementis in 10 books, which we have only in the Latin translation of Rufinus, are different versions of the same work, which is cited

§ 42.

GNOSTICS.

SOURCES: *Irenæus* adv. hæreses (particularly against Valentine). *Tertullian.* adv. Marcionem libb. V. De præscriptionibus hæreticorum. Adv. Valentinianos. Contra Gnosticos scorpiacum. *Epiphanius* adv. hæreses. *Clemens Alex.* and *Origen* passim. — The work of *Plotinus*, the neo-Platonic philosopher, *πρὸς τοὺς γνωστικοὺς* (Ennead. II. lib. 9.).

Isaac de Beausobre histoire critique de Manichée et du Manichéisme. Amst. 1734 and 1739. 2 T. 4to. — *J. L. Moshemii* de rebus Christian. ante Const. M. comm. p. 333-410. — (F. Münter's) Versuch über die kirchlichen Alterthümer der Gnostiker. Anspach. 1790. 8vo. — *E. A. Lewald* comm. de doctrina gnostica. Heidelberg. 1818. 8vo. — Aug. Neander's Genetische Entwickelung d. vornehmsten gnostischen Systeme. Berlin. 1818. 8vo. (Vid. Review of the same by Gieseler in the Hallischen All. Lit. Zeitung for April, 1823). Also Kirchengeschichte. Bd. 1. Abtheilung 2. S. 627 ff. [N. Lardner's Hist. of Heretics. Lond. 1780. 4to. — Encycl. Britann. — Tr.]

The speculations, to which we have remarked a tendency in Cerinthus (§ 34), were more fully developed in the systems of the Syrian and Egyptian Gnostics.[1] The philosophical basis of these speculations was the old question of the *origin of evil.*[2] It was allowed that the origin of evil must be in matter, which was supposed to be eternal

---

by Origen (Philocal. 22. cf. Recogn. X. c. 10) under the name of *περίοδοι Πέτρου*, as a book generally known A. D. 231, and which therefore must have been written at the end of the 2d century. cf. *Mosheim* dissert. ad hist. eccl. pertin. Vol. I. p. 174 seq. — D. v. Coelln in Ersch and Gruber's Encycloped. Th. 18. S. 36 ff. — In the Clementines (which is the work mentioned by Epiphan. hær. 30, as the *περίοδοι Πέτρου* of the Ebionites) is found the best exposition of the Ebionite doctrines. See Neander's Entwickelung der gnost. Systeme, S. 361 ff. Kirchengeschichte. Bd. 1. Abth. 2. S. 619 ff. D. K. A. Credner über Essäer und Ebioniten. Winer's Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie, Bd. 1. S. 211 ff. und 277 ff.

1 See, on the origin of Gnosticism, *Lewald* l. c. p. 60 seq. The church fathers attributed it to the Heathen philosophy, especially to *Platonism* (*Tert. adv. Hermog.* c. 8: hæreticorum patriarchæ philosophi. *De anima*, c. 23: Plato omnium hæreticorum condimentarius), and class the theosophic dreams of the Gnostics with the Heathen fables. Before Mosheim the prevailing opinion was in favor of this derivation; as also Beausobre. Others derive it from the Jewish *Cabbala* (*Jo. Croii* conjecturæ in quædam loca Origenis, Irenæi, etc., affixed to Grabe's Irenæus; *F. Buddei* diss. de hæresi Valentiniana, affixed to the introd. ad histor. philos. Hebr. ed. 2. Halæ. 1720. 8vo. p. 619 seq. *Jac. Basnage* histoire des Juifs, liv. III. p. 718 seq.) — From an *Oriental Philosophy* (= x), especially Mosheim: comp. Lücke in Schleiermacher's, De Wette's, and Lücke's theol. Zeitschrift, Heft 2. S. 138 ff. — From the system of the *Zendavesta*, *Lewald* l. c. p. 106 ff. Comp. on the other side, Allg. Lit. Zeitung. April, 1823. — See especially Neander's Kirchengeschichte. Bd. 1. Abth. 2. S. 627 ff.

2 *Tertull.* de præscript. hæret. c. 7: Eædem materiæ apud hæreticos et philosophos volutantur, iidem retractatus implicantur, unde malum et quare? et unde homo et quomodo? *Euseb.* hist. eccl. V. 27. *πολυθρύλλητον παρὰ τοῖς αἱρετικοῖς ζήτημα τὸ πόθεν ἡ κακία;*

and self-existent. But then came the question, How could a perfect God have had any contact with this matter, to impregnate it with seeds of life? Thus predisposed to attribute the creation of the world to some imperfect being,[3] men were led to observe in the Scriptures the different character of the Jehovah of the Old Testament and the God of the Christians, of Judaism and Christianity.[4] The God of the Jews they called the *Demiurgus*, whom they supposed to be descended from the Supreme God, through a long succession of Æons. All the seeds of life in this world they supposed to be of three kinds. Of these only one, the human *Pneuma* (spirit) belongs to the world of light. The others belong either to the Demiurgus, like the human *Psyche*, or else, like all bodies, and the evil principles which dwell in them, to the *Hyle* or matter. To the salvation of the Pneumata it is necessary for them to get free from the fetters of matter and the Demiurgus, and seek to know the Supreme God, in order that they may return to him. For this end Christ, one of the highest Æons, came down upon the earth. Thus the Christians are under the influence of the world of light, whilst the Jews are still subject to the Demiurgus, and the heathen in bondage to the Hyle.[5] These general notions were variously carried out in the various schools. Amongst the Alexandrian Gnostics the influence of the Platonic philosophy is as evident[6] as the influence of Parsism amongst the Syrians. The former lean more to the doctrine of Emanation, and the latter to

---

3 Even according to Plato (Tim. 325) the Supreme Being imparted to mankind only the spiritual part of their nature, leaving to the lower Gods τὸ θνητὸν προσυφαίνειν. So also in Philo (de mundi opif. p. 16, de ling. conf. p. 346, de profug. p. 460), τὸ ἄλογον, τὸ θνητὸν ἡμῶν τῆς ψυχῆς μέρος, was formed by the angels. cf. *Lucretius* de rerum natura, V. 196 seq.

> Quod si jam rerum ignorem primordia quæ sint,
> Hoc tamen ex ipsis cœli rationibus ausim
> Confirmare, alieisque ex rebus reddere multeis,
> Nequaquam nobis divinitus esse paratam
> Naturam rerum: tanta stat prædita culpa.

4 *Origenes* de princ. l. IV. (Philocalia ed. Spencer, p. 6): εἴ τι ἀπὸ τῶν αἱρέσεων ἀναγινώσκοντες τὸ· πῦρ ἐκκέκαυται ἐκ τοῦ θυμοῦ μου (Jer. xv. 14; Exod. xx. 5; 1 Reg. xv. 11; Es. xlv. 7; Am. iii. 6; Mic. i. 12; 1 Reg. xvi. 15); καὶ μυρία ὅσα τούτοις παραπλήσια, ἀπιστῆσαι μὲν ὡς θεοῦ ταῖς γραφαῖς οὐ τετολμήκασι, πιστεύοντες δὲ αὐτὰς εἶναι τοῦ δημιουργοῦ, ᾧ Ἰουδαῖοι λατρεύουσιν, ᾠήθησαν ὡς ἀτελοῦς καὶ οὐκ ἀγαθοῦ τυγχάνοντος τοῦ δημιουργοῦ, τὸν σωτῆρα ἐπιδεδημηκέναι τελειότερον καταγγέλλοντα θεὸν, ὃν φασι μὴ τὸν δημιουργὸν τυγχάνειν, διαφόρως περὶ τούτου κινούμενοι, καὶ ἅπαξ ἀποστάντες τοῦ δημιουργοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν ἀγένητος μόνος θεὸς, ἀνασκλασμοῖς ἑαυτοὺς ἐπιδεδώκασι, μυθοποιοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς ὑποθέσεις, καθ' ἃς οἴονται γεγονέναι τὰ βλεπόμενα, καὶ ἕτερα τινὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα, ἅπερ ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτῶν ἀνειδωλοποίησεν. Passages from the New Testament also seem to have been cited by the Gnostics in support of this distinction, e. g. Joh. xii. 31; xiv. 30; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Gal. iii. 19; 1 Cor. ii. 6, 7; Eph. iii. 9 seq.

5 The Christians recurred too, here, to the notion which they had adopted from the Jews, of the division of the world under different angels (*Keilii* opusc. Sect. II.), representing the Heathen Gods as evil angels. (Keil. p. 584 seq. 601 seq.)

6 *Plotinus* contra Gnosticos, c. 6: ὅλως γὰρ αὐτοῖς τὰ μὲν παρὰ τοῦ Πλάτωνος εἴληπται· τὰ δὲ, ὅσα καινοτομοῦσιν, ἵνα ἰδίαν φιλοσοφίαν θῶνται, ταῦτα ἔξω τῆς ἀληθείας εὕρηται.

Dualism.[7] In all the schools, however, a wide field was left for the imagination in tracing out the internal relations of the world of light, the manner in which the Demiurgus sprung from it, and the creation of the world. The Alexandrian Gnostics, in their speculations on these subjects, followed vaguely a notion, borrowed from the Platonic doctrine of ideas, that the visible world is an image of the invisible.[8] With this they readily united the allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures, already in use, which they managed in the most arbitrary way. All the Gnostics laid great stress on certain secret doctrines, which they claimed to have received from the Apostles. As their chief aim was *to free the soul from the fetters of matter and the Demiurgus*, they were naturally led to adopt a life of abstinence and contemplation. In later times, however, their moral sense being overborne by the pride of dogmatism, they but too frequently adopted the notion that all moral laws were the work of the Demiurgus, and in accordance with this gave an entire loose to their passions.[9]

§ 43.

(Continuation.) 1. ALEXANDRIAN GNOSTICS.

I. According to *Basilides* of Alexandria (about the year 125), there emanated from the great first cause (*θεὸς ἄρρητος*) seven Æons (*νοῦς, λόγος, φρόνησις, σοφία, δύναμις, δικαιοσύνη, εἰρήνη*), composing the first world of spirits (*οὐρανός*); from this again emanated successively 365 other heavens, which together are expressed by the mystic word *Ἀβραξας*.[1] By the seven angels of the lowest heaven he supposes the world to have been made, under the superintendence of the God of the Jews, *ὁ ἄρχων*. To bring about the restoration of the soul of man

---

7 On Neander's distinction between the Jewish and Anti-Jewish Gnostics, see Hall. Allg. Lit. Zeitung, for April, 1823. On the other side, Neander's Kirchengeschichte, Bd. I. Abth. 2. S. 641 ff.

8 So particularly in the system of the Valentinians, *Iren.* II. 7. It is the Sophia, quæ emittit similitudines et imagines eorum, quæ sursum sunt. C. 8: in honorem eorum, quæ sursum sunt, facta sunt hæc secundum illorum imaginem.

9 *Clement. Alex.* Strom. III. p. 529: *αἱρέσεις — ἢ — ἀδιαφόρως ζῆν διδάσκουσιν, ἢ τὸ ὑπέρτονον ἀγουσαι, ἐγκράτειαν διὰ δυσσεβείας καὶ φιλαπεχθημοσύνης καταγγέλλουσι.* cf. 11. p. 411. *Plotinus contra Gnosticos*, c. 15: *ὁ δὲ λόγος οὗτος (τῶν Γνωστικῶν) — τὴν πρόνοιαν μεμψάμενος, καὶ πάντας νόμους τοὺς ἐνταῦθα ἀτιμάσας, καὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν — τό, τε σωφρονεῖν τοῦτο ἐν γέλωτι θέμενος, ἵνα μηδὲν καλὸν ἐνταῦθα δὴ ὀρθεῖν ὑπάρχον, ἀνεῖλε τό, τε σωφρονεῖν καὶ τὴν ἐν τοῖς ἤθεσι σύμφυτον δικαιοσύνην, τὴν τελουμένην ἐκ λόγου καὶ ἀσκήσεως· — ὥστε αὐτοῖς καταλείπεσθαι τὴν ἡδονὴν, καὶ τὸ περὶ αὐτοὺς, καὶ τὸ οὐ κοινὸν πρὸς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους, καὶ τὸ τῆς χρείας μόνον.*

1 J. J. Bellermann Versuch über die Gemmen der Alten mit dem Abraxas-Bilde. Berlin. 1817–19. 3 Stücke; and *F. Kopp* Palæographia critica, P. III. & IV. Manhemii. 1829 & 30. 4to. Affixed to the Histoire critique du Gnosticisme par *I. Matter.* 2 Tom. Paris. 1828. 8vo., is a collection of impressions of these Abraxas gems, though they evidently did not all originate with the Gnostics, (see Article by Gieseler in the Theol. Studien und Kritiken, for 1830. Heft 2. S. 403 ff.)

to the world of light, the νοῦς was supposed to have united itself with the man Jesus at his baptism; and hence the followers of Basilides celebrated the festival of the baptism as the Epiphany [or festival of Christ's appearance, vid. § 70, note 8. — Tr.] on the 11th of Tybi (6th of January).[2] The sufferings of Jesus were endured only by the man, and not by the νοῦς, and, like all other human sufferings, were the punishment of past sins, committed perhaps in a former state of existence. The *Archon* (ἄρχων) of Basilides is not a malevolent, but an ignorant being, and submits at once to the appointments of the higher powers, as soon as made known to him. The followers of Basilides, on the contrary,[3] considered the Archon as the open adversary of the world of light; thus casting Judaism, in which their master had traced a preparation for something higher, entirely away. They also adopted the views of the Docetæ (vid. § 34) into their system, and showed themselves very ingenious in inventing sophisms to favor their moral laxity. They rendered themselves most odious, however, by denying the faith, in order to escape the persecutions. This sect is found as late as the year 400.[4]

II. Still more ingenious is the system of *Valentine*, who came from Alexandria to Rome about the year 140, and died in Cyprus about the year 160.[5] He taught that from the great original of all things (βυθός, προπάτωρ, προαρχή), with whom dwells his own self-consciousness (ἔννοια, σιγή), there emanated alternately male and female Æons to the number of 30, (Νοῦς or Μονογενής and ἀλήθεια, λόγος and ζωή, ἄνθρωπος and ἐκκλησία, etc.), which together (distinguished into the Ὀγδοάς, Δεκάς, and Δωδεκάς) constitute the *Pleroma*. From the passionate struggles of the last of the Æons, the σοφία, to unite with the original source of all (βυθός), sprung an imperfect being Achamoth (ἡ κατὼ σοφία, ἐνθύμησις, Ἀχαμώθ, i. e. חָכְמוֹת), which, wandering outside the Pleroma, imparted life to matter and formed the *Demiurgus* of psychical material, by whom the world was created. In this

---

2 Probably in imitation of the Egyptians, who on that day celebrated the inventio Osiridis, see *Jablonski* de origine festi nativitatis Christi diss. II. § 7 seq., in his Opuscul. ed. *te Water*. T. III. p. 358 seq. He is wrong, however, in concluding from *Clem. Alex.* Strom. III. p. 340, that the followers of Basilides celebrated the birth of Jesus on the Epiphany, as well as his baptism.

3 The true system of Basilides is to be found in Clemens Alexandrinus; that of his followers in Irenæus; see Neander's gnost. Systeme, S. 31.

4 The sources of information concerning Basilides are: the Tradition of Glaucias, an interpreter (ἑρμηνεῦς) of the Apostle Peter, and a tradition concerning the Apostle Matthias. — Prophets Βαρκάβας, Βαρκὼφ, Παρχώρ. — He wrote 24 books of ἐξηγετικά, which may also perhaps be called his gospel.

5 *J. F. Buddeus* de hæresi Valentiniana, affixed to his introductio ad historiam philos. Ebræorum. ed. 2. Halæ. 1720. 8vo. It is remarkable that Valentine not only acknowledged the New Testament, but made constant use of it in explaining his system, though always allegorically. — His writings are: Secret Doctrine of Theobades, a pupil of Paul. — Hymns, Addresses, and Letters (for the most part lost). From the work entitled, Fidelis Sophia, preserved in the Copt language, *D. F. Münter* has published Odæ gnosticæ, thebaice et latine. Havniæ. 1812. [See Bish. Kaye on Tertullian, p. 514–525. — Tr.]

there are three kinds of material, the *pneumatic*, the *psychic*, and the *hylic*. The course of things in this world is to result in the separation of the first two from the last; the pneumatic material returning to the Pleroma, and the psychic to the intermediate place where the Achamoth now dwells. In the mean time two new Æons, Christ and the Holy Spirit, having come into existence in order to restore the interrupted harmony of the Pleroma, there emanated from all the Æons, Jesus the Saviour (σωτήρ), the future companion (σύζυγος) of the Achamoth, and destined to lead back to the Pleroma this and all other pneumatic natures. At the baptism the Saviour united itself with the psychic Messiah, which had been promised by the Demiurgus; and, in correspondence to this union, the letter of the instructions of Jesus is for the merely psychic amongst men, whilst the spirit, which is put into them by the *Soter* or Saviour, is for the pneumatic, or spiritual. These theosophic dreams could of course be carried out in various ways, and thus we find amongst the pupils of Valentine numerous variations. The most distinguished of his followers were Heracleon,[6] Ptolemy,[7] and Marcus.[8]

III. The system of the *Ophites*[9] was nearly allied to that of Valentine, though it is possible that they existed as a sect before his time.[10] Their Pleroma is less complicated than his. From the first principle (Bythus) emanate the *first man*, the *second man*, and the *holy spirit*. This last gives birth to two beings of light, one male and perfect, which is Christ, the other female and imperfect, the Sophia, Achamoth, Prouneikos. The creator of the world, Jaldabaoth, the chief of the seven who preside over the planets, is ambitious and malevolent, and hence involved in perpetual strife with his mother Sophia, who is constantly seeking to wrest from him the higher or pneumatic natures. The Ophiomorphus, the ruler of the Hyle and origin of all evil, is his image. The doctrines of the Ophites concerning Christ correspond exactly to those of Valentine, excepting that Jesus is the psychic, Christ the pneumatic Messiah.[11] They were divided into various sects (e. g. Sethians, Cainites). One of these sects attempt-

---

6 Of his comm. on John there are numerous fragments in the comm. of Origen.

7 His epistola ad Floram in *Epiphanius* hær. XXXIII.

8 According to Irenæus (Iren. I, 18), the followers of the last were distinguished by the custom of anointing the dying. See Chemnitii examen Concil. Trid. P. II. p. 390.

9 J. L. v. Mosheim Versuch einer unpartheischen und gründlichen Ketzergeschichte. Geschichte der Schlangenbrüder der ersten Kirche. Helmstädt. 2te Aufl. 1748. 4to. [Neander's Church Hist. Vol. I. — Tr.]

10 *Origines c. Celsum.* VI. § 28. ed. Spenc. p. 294: Ὀφιανοὶ τοσοῦτον ἀποδέουσι τοῦ εἶναι Χριστιανοί, ὥστε οὐκ ἔλαττον Κέλσου κατήγορεῖν αὐτοὺς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ· καὶ μὴ πρότερον προσίεσθαί τινα ἐπὶ τὸ συνέδριον ἑαυτῶν, ἐὰν μὴ ἀρὰς θῆται κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. Mosheim (l. c. S. 19, & S. 127) draws the inference from this that the Ophites were an ancient Jewish party, who only in part adopted Christianity. On the other side Allg. Lit. Zeitung, for April, 1823.

11 On the διάγραμμα of the Ophites, Origen contr. Celsum VI. ed. Spencer, p. 291 seq.; see Mosheim, l. c. S. 79 ff.; 178 ff.

ed to identify the Serpent in Genesis with the Sophia, and hence the name of the whole party. Of all the Gnostic sects this lasted the longest. (As late as A. D. 530, Justinian enacted laws against them. Vid. Cod. Lib. I. Tit. 5. L. 18, 19, 21.)

IV. *Carpocrates* adopted an entirely different theory.[12] He considered Jesus a mere man, who, like Pythagoras, Plato, and Aristotle, had shown by his example how the Gnostic was to free himself from the Demiurgi (*ἄγγελοι κοσμοποιοί*), and unite with the Supreme God (*μονάς*). His followers had in their sanctuaries the portraits of those Grecian philosophers together with that of Jesus. After the death of their master's son, Epiphanes, a youth of seventeen,[13] they built him a temple in Cephalenia. This sect, as well as the kindred sects of the *Antitactes* and the *Prodicians*,[14] are stigmatized by the open profession of immorality.[15]

---

12 *G. H. F. Fuldner* de Carpocratianis, in Illgens historisch.-theolog. Abhandlungen, dritte Denkschrift der hist. theol. Gesellschaft zu Leipzig. 1824. S. 180 ff. *G. Gesenius* de inscriptione Phœnicio-Græca in Cyrenaica nuper reperta ad Carpocratianorum hæresin pertinente. Halæ. 1825. 4to.

13 Fragments of a work of his *περὶ δικαιοσύνης* preserved in *Clemens Alex.* Strom. III. p. 512 seq. His moral principles: *οἱ νόμοι, ἀνθρώπων ἀμαθίαν κολάζειν μὴ δυνάμενοι, παρανομεῖν ἐδίδαξαν· ἡ γὰρ ἰδιότης τῶν νόμων τὴν κοινωνίαν τοῦ θείου νόμου κατέτεμεν καὶ παραπρώγει.* — *Κοινῇ ὁ θεὸς ἅπαντα ἀνθρώτῳ ποιήσας, καὶ τὸ θῆλυ τῷ ἄῤῥενι κοινῇ συναγαγὼν, καὶ πάνθ' ὁμοίως τὰ ζῶα κολλήσας, τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἀνέφηνεν κοινωνίαν μετ' ἰσότητος.*

14 Concerning the *Αντιτάκται* cf. *Clemens* Strom., III. p. 526. *Theodoret.* hær. fab. comp. I. c. 16; concerning *Προδικοι*, *Clemens*, l. c. p. 525. *Theodoret.* l. c. I. c. 6.

15 Comp. the remarkable inscriptions published by Gesenius (l. c. p. 13): I. with the false date Olmyp. LXXXVI. ann. 3. i. e. B. C. 434): *Ἡ πασῶν οὐσιῶν καὶ γυναικῶν κοινότης πηγὴ τῆς θείας ἐστὶ δικαιοσύνης, εἰρήνη τε τελεία τοῖς τοῦ τυφλοῦ ὄχλου ἐκλεκτοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδράσιν, οὓς Ζαράδης τε καὶ Πυθαγόρας, τῶν ἱεροφαντῶν ἄριστοι, κοινῇ συμβιωτεῖν συνίεντο.* — II. *Θῶθ, Κρόνος, Ζωροάστρης, Πυθαγόρας, Ἐπίκουρος, Μασδάκης, Ἰωάννης, Χριστός τε καὶ οἱ ἡμέτεροι Κυρανεϊκοὶ καθηγηταὶ συμφώνως ἐντέλλουσιν ἡμῖν, μηδὲν οἰκειοποιεῖσθαι, τοῖς δὲ νόμοις ἀῤῥήγειν, καὶ τὴν παρανομίαν καταπολεμεῖν· τοῦτο γὰρ ἡ τῆς δικαιοσύνης πηγὴ, τοῦτο τὸ μακαρίως ἐν κοινῇ ζῆν.* If the Masdak here mentioned is the same, who, according to later Oriental writers, led the Persian king Cobades to introduce the community of women amongst his subjects (of which, however, the contemporary historian Procopius, who speaks of the reformations attempted by Cobades, de bello Pers. I. c. 5, takes no notice), then these Gnostic sects must have continued for several centuries after the 6th. But it may be conjectured that in both cases the Masdak mentioned is only a fictitious personage, whose name is taken from the national name of the *Massagetes*, who from all antiquity were distinguished (cf. Herod. I. c. 216 etc.) by this custom. — Clemens also, Strom. II. p. 490, and VII. p. 850, classes these Gnostic sects with the Cyrenaics (*Κυρανεϊκοὶ*), — namely, with Aristippus.

§ 44.

(Continuation.) 2. SYRIAN GNOSTICS.

Amongst the Syrian Gnostics we find the doctrine of Dualism more distinctly developed than amongst the Alexandrians; to which, no doubt, the neighbourhood of Persia may much have contributed. With this was connected their ascetic fanaticism, in which they went far beyond the Egyptians, and their leaning to the views of the Docetæ,[1] (vid. § 34). *Saturninus* at Antioch, a contemporary of Basilides, taught that from the great first principle (*πατὴρ ἄγνωστος*) was developed in successive gradations the world of spirits; in the lowest grade of which he placed the angels of the seven planets (*ἄγγελοι κοσμοκράτορες*). Opposed to them stood the evil principle (Satan), by whom was created a race of evil men to oppose the race of good men created by the Supreme God, who belong to the light. In order to avoid all contact with the evil principle, the followers of Saturninus neither married, nor partook of animal food. The prevalence of Gnostic principles in Syria, and in the countries farther East, is strikingly seen in the case of *Bardesanes* in Edessa (about the year 172),[2] who was held to be orthodox, though he believed in two eternal principles, derived all evil from the Hyle, and held many other of the Gnostic tenets. Cotemporary with him was the Assyrian *Tatian*,[3] a pupil of Justin Martyr; after whose death he founded a Gnostic sect in his own country, which was chiefly distinguished by the rigid observance of an ascetic and self-denying life. This sect continued to exist throughout the fourth century.

§ 45.

(Continuation.) 3. MARCION AND HIS SCHOOL.[1]

The Gnosis of *Marcion* is of a peculiar character. He was the son of the bishop of Sinope, and studied in Rome (between A. D.

---

1 Allg. Lit. Zeitung, for April, 1823.

2 Under the prince *Abgar bar Manu* he dedicated his book *περὶ εἱμαρμένης* to Antoninus Verus, of which Euseb. præp Evang. VI. 10. has preserved a fragment (republished in Alexandri Aphrodisiensis, Ammonii, Plotini, Bardesanis, et Gemisti Plethonis de fato quæ supersunt græce, rec. et notas adjecit *J. C. Orellius*. Turici. 1824. 8vo.) Bardesanes gained many followers by his hymns. Of great importance for the knowledge of his system are the 56 hymns of Ephraem Syrus against heresy; cf. Bardesanes Gnosticus Syrorum primus hymnologus. comm. historico-theol. quam scripsit *Aug. Hahn*. Lips. 1819. 8vo.

3 Of his Apology hereafter. — *Εὐαγγέλιον διὰ τεσσάρων.*

1 Sources: *Tertull. adv. Marcionem* libri V. — (Pseudo-) *Origenis διάλογος περὶ τῆς εἰς θεὸν ὀρθῆς πίστεως*, s. dial. contra Marcionitas (ed. *J. R. Wetstein*. Basil. 1674. 4to. — Subject is treated by Neander gnost. Syst. S. 276 ff. *Aug. Hahn*

140 and 150), where he became a follower of the Syrian Cerdo, and gradually matured a system of his own. He supposes three moral principles, or sources of all things, a good Deity, a just Deity, and the Hyle. To free mankind from the yoke of the just Deity, from whom they had only to expect either damnation, or at best a limited happiness, according to the strictest measure of justice, Christ is supposed to have descended and appeared at Capernaum, proclaiming to men the good Deity, whom as yet they had never known. Those who believe on Christ, and out of free love to the good Deity lead an holy life, will be made happy in his heavenly kingdom; whilst the rest will be left to the strict justice of the Demiurgus. Marcion required of all perfect Christians to lead an ascetic life, to forbear from wedlock, to avoid the pleasures of the world, and restrict themselves to the simplest food. These rules were not strictly observed by all his followers, however, as they did not at once become perfect Christians, but long remained Catechumens. Marcion's Gospel was that of St. Luke, so altered as to suit his system. Besides this, he retained ten of the Epistles of St. Paul, though not without corruptions.[2] A work of his, entitled "Antitheses," contained a contrast of Judaism with Christianity.

With metaphysics Marcion does not meddle, except as far as they affect the moral interests of mankind. His disciples, therefore, borrowed their notions on these subjects either from the Syrian Gnostics, or, like *Apelles*, from the Valentinians; so that afterwards the school of Marcion was divided into a number of sects.[3]

---

diss. de gnosi Marcionis antinomi. Regiomonti. 4to. (zwei Weihnachts-programme von 1820 und 1821.) *Ejusd.* Antitheses Marcionis Gnostici liber deperditus, nunc quoad ejus fieri potuit restitutus. Regiom, 1823. 8vo. The same, das Evangelium Marcions in seiner ursprünglichen Gestalt, nebst dem vollständigsten Beweise dargestellt, dasz es nicht selbstständig, sondern ein verstümmeltes und verfälschtes Lucas-Evangelium war. Königsberg. 1823. 8vo. Comp. Giesel er's Recension in the Hall. Allg. Lit. Zeitung. Oct. 1823. S. 225 ff.

2 This is doubted, first by *Semler* (in his Paraphrasis epist. ad Galatas. Hal. 1779. 8vo. Prolegom. § 2, 3). Then by *C. F. J. Loeffler* diss., qua Marcionem Pauli epistolas et Lucæ evangel. adulterasse dubitatur, 1788. 4to, (reprinted in the commentatt. theol. coll. a *Kuinoel* et *Ruperti*. Vol. I. p. 180). The hypothesis was carried out by H. Corodi, J. G. Eichhorn, and J. E. Ch. Schmidt. Of a different opinion is Dr. Gratz, Krit. Untersuchung über Marcion's Evangel. Tüb. 1818. 8vo. Comp. especially the work of *Hahn*, cited in note 1. Also his diss. de canone Marcionis, P. I. 1824. 4to. Also, his Erstes Capitel des Evang. Marcions, im Kirchenhist. Archiv. für 1825.

3 *Rhodon* (ap. Euseb. V. 13) says: διὰ τοῦτο καὶ παρ' ἑαυτοῖς ἀσύμφωνοι γεγόνασιν, ἀπὸ γὰρ τῆς τούτων ἀγίλης Ἀπελλῆς μὲν — — μίαν ἀρχὴν ὁμολογεῖ· — ἕτεροι δὲ, καθὼς καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ ναύτης Μαρκίων, δύο ἀρχὰς εἰσηγοῦνται· — ἄλλοι δὲ πάλιν ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον ἐξοκείλαντες, οὐ μόνον δύο ἀλλὰ καὶ τρεῖς ὑποτίθενται φύσεις. Comp. Allg. Lit. Zeit. a. a. O. S. 226 ff.

§ 46.

MONTANISTS AND ALOGI.

In defence of the Montanists, see *Nic. Rigaltius* in præfat. ad Tertulliani opp. Arnolds Kirchen- und Ketzergeschichte. Th. I. Bd. 2. K. 4, § 44. *Gottl. Wernsdorf* de Montanistis seculi secundi hæreticis comm. Gedani. 1751. 4to. — More impartial are *Mosheim* de rebus Christ. ante Const. M. p. 410–424. M. Merkels hist. krit. Aufklärung der Streitigkeit der Aloger über die Apocalypsis. Frankf. 1782. 8vo. [See also *Bishop Kaye* on Tertullian, pp. 12–96. — Neanders Kirchengeschichte. Bd. 1. Abtheil. 3. p. 580 ff. — Tr.]

As in every country we find Christianity stamped more or less distinctly with the national character, so also in Phrygia it did not escape the influence of the popular tendency to a sensual religious enthusiasm. This found widest scope in the doctrines of supernatural gifts, of the renunciation of the world, and the millennium, which seem very early to have been the favorite topics of discussion in this region,[1] and the attention to them was probably quickened by persecution, and a spirit of opposition to the doctrines of the Gnostics. Montanus,* at Pepuza, (about the year 150) began to proclaim in prophetic ecstasy, that the Paraclete had revealed itself to him in order to give to the church its full maturity. He was soon joined by two female prophets, Maximilla and Priscilla; and thus a party was formed, claiming to be the only spiritual Christians (πνευματικοὶ), and looking down on all others with contempt as carnal (ψυχικοί). They did not interfere with doctrines; but, on the other hand, they prescribed new and rigorous fasts, forbade second marriages, magnified beyond all bounds the honor of celibacy, martyrdom, and contempt for worldly things, and punished incontinence, murder, and idolatry with perpetual exclusion from the church.[2] At the same time they

---

1 E. g. Philip and his daughters in Hierapolis (to whom the Montanist Proculus refers Euseb. III. 31), and Papias (§ 33, note 8.).

* According to *Didymus* de Trinit. lib. III. cap. penult., Montanus had formerly been a Heathen priest. *Hieronymus* Ep. 27 ad Marcellam, calls him abscissum et semivirum. He appears, therefore, to have been a priest of Cybele, a circumstance of some importance in one view of his system.

2 *Tertull. de virginibus velandis*, c. 1: Regula quidem fidei una omnino est, sola immobilis, et irreformabilis. — Cætera jam disciplinæ et conversationis admittunt novitatem correctionis: — cum propterea Paracletum miserit Dominus, ut, quoniam humana mediocritas omnia semel capere non poterat, paulatim dirigeretur et ordinaretur, et ad perfectum perduceretur disciplina ab illo vicario Dei, spiritu sancto. From John xvi. he argues, that the office of the Paraclete is, Quod disciplina dirigitur, quod scripturæ revelantur, quod intellectus reformatur, quod ad meliora proficitur. — As all things in nature attain their perfection gradually, sic et justitia — primo fuit in rudimentis, natura deum metuens. Dehinc per legem et prophetas promovit in infantiam. Dehinc per Evangelium efferbuit in juventutem. Nunc per Paracletum componitur in maturitatem. Comp. the other writings of Tertullian in defence of particular Montanistic institutions, *De exhortat. castitatis, De monogamia, De fuga in persecutione, De jejunio adv. Psychicos, De pudicitia.*

foretold with the utmost confidence the approaching end of the world and the commencement of the Millennium.[3]

In this way the Montanists of course drew upon themselves the dislike of all around them. For the most part their opponents contented themselves with denying their prophetic gifts,[4] and it was on this ground alone that they were excluded from the communion of the churches in Asia Minor.[5] Some, however, in the heat of controversy, began to reject all those things from the creed of the church, out of which the errors of the Montanists had grown.[6] This was carried farthest by those afterwards called *Alogi*, who denied the con-

---

3 Maximilla, according to *Euseb.* V. 16, 8, prophesied *πολέμους ἔσεσθαι καὶ ἀκαταστασίας*: according to *Epiphan.* hær. 48, c. 2, *ὅτι μετ' ἐμὲ προφῆτις οὐκέτι ἔσται, ἀλλὰ συντέλεια.* Priscilla or Quintilla, *Epiphan.* hær. 49, c. 1: *ἐν ἰδίᾳ γυναικὸς ἐσχηματισμένος ἐν στολῇ λαμπρᾷ ἦλθε πρός με Χριστὸς, καὶ ἐνέβαλεν ἐν ἐμοὶ τὴν σοφίαν, καὶ ἀπεκάλυψέ μοι, τουτονὶ τὸν τόπον (τὴν Πεπούζην) εἶναι ἅγιον, καὶ ὧδε τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατίναι.* cf. *Tertullian. de resurrect. carnis*, c. 63: At enim Deus omnipotens — effundens in novissimis diebus de suo spiritu in omnem carnem, in servos suos et ancillas, et fidem laborantem resurrectionis carnalis animavit, et pristina instrumenta manifestis verborum et sensuum luminibus ab omni ambiguitatis obscuritate purgavit. — (Spiritus sanctus) jam omnes retro ambiguitates et quas volunt parabolas, aperta atque perspicua totius sacramenti prædicatione discussit, per novam prophetiam de paracleto inundantem. *The same*, in a fragment, *Prædestinatus hær.* 26: Hoc solum discrepamus (a Psychicis), quod secundas nuptias non recipimus, et prophetiam Montani de futuro judicio non recusamus.

4 *Eusebius* h. e. V. c. 16–19, mentions the polemic writings of *Apollinaris*, *Miltiades*, an *Anonymous* writer (according to *Hieronym.* cat. c. 37 and c. 39, *Rhodon*; by several modern writers supposed, without sufficient grounds, to have been *Asterius Urbanus.* cf. *Wernsdorf* de Montanistis, p. 4.), *Apollonius*, and *Serapion*, and gives extracts from the writings of the three last. — The *ἔκστασις* of the Montanistic prophets gave particular offence. cf. *Anonymus* apud Euseb. V. 16, 3, and *Miltiadis σύγγραμμα περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν προφήτην ἐν ἐκστάσει λαλεῖν* (Euseb. V. 17, 1), *Tertull. adv. Marcion.* IV. c. 22: Defendimus, in causa novæ prophetiæ, gratiæ ecstasin, id est amentiam, convenire. In spiritu enim homo constitutus, præsertim cum gloriam Dei conspicit, vel cum per ipsum Deus loquitur, necesse est excidat sensu, obumbratus scilicet virtute divina: de quo inter nos et Psychicos quæstio est. Hence, *De Anima*, c. 11: Ecstasis, sancti spiritus vis, operatrix prophetiæ. According to *Hieron.* cat. c. 53, Tertullian wrote also de Ecstasi libros VI. Vid. the description of these Montanistic convulsions, in which a striking resemblance may be traced to the phenomena of animal magnetism, in *Tert. de anima*, c. 9: Est hodie soror apud nos revelationum charismata sortita, quas in Ecclesia inter Dominica solennia per ecstasin in spiritu patitur, conversatur cum angelis, aliquando etiam cum Domino, et videt et audit sacramenta, et quorundam corda dinoscit, et medicinas desiderantibus submittit etc.

5 *Anonymus* ap. Euseb. V. 16, 5.

6 To this number belong those who rejected Chiliasm, whom *Justin*, dial. c. Tryph. c. 80, designates as *πολλοὺς, καὶ τῶν τῆς καθαρᾶς καὶ εὐσεβοῦς ὄντων Χριστιανῶν γνώμης*, but of whom *Ireuæus* V. c. 31, says: Quidam ex his, qui putantur recte credidisse, supergrediuntur ordinem promotionis justorum, — hæreticos sensus in se habentes. Also those who disputed the Apocalypse, *Dionysius Alex. περὶ ἐπαγγελιῶν* in *Euseb.* VII. c. 25: *τινὲς μὲν οὖν τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν ἠθέτησαν καὶ ἀνεσκεύασαν πάντῃ τὸ βιβλίον κ. τ. λ.*, going so far as to hold Cerinthus for its author.

tinuance of the gifts of the Holy Spirit in the church, and the Millennium, and rejected the Apocalypse, as well as the Gospel of St. John.[7]

It is very possible that the extremes, to which the opponents of Montanism thus allowed themselves to be led, may have largely contributed to its success in the West.[8] The Western churches never declared themselves exclusively in favor of any of the conflicting parties of Asia;[9] and thus the tenets of the Montanists, which, after all, were only the doctrines of the church carried out to their full extent, could be very widely adopted,[10] without any necessity of forming a separate party.

The Asiatic Montanists, who had a peculiar form of church government,[11] are found as late as the 6th century.[12] Besides their usual names of *Montanistæ*, *Cataphryges* (*οἱ κατὰ Φούγας*), we find various others applied to them, some of which, doubtless, designated particular parties, while others were only used in derision.[13]

---

7 Comp. especially the work of Merkel, above cited, whom also Olshausen follows, Aechtheit der vier canon. Evang. p. 254 ff. *Irenæus* III. c. 11: Alii vero, ut donum Spiritus frustrentur, quod in novissimis temporibus secundum placitum patris effusum est in humanum genus, illam speciem non admittunt, quæ est secundum Joannis evangelium, in qua Paracletum se missurum Dominus promisit; sed simul evangelium et propheticum repellunt Spiritum. Infelices vere, qui pseudoprophetæ [*leg.* pseudoprophetas] quidem esse volunt, prophetiæ vero gratiam ab ecclesia repellunt; similia patientes his, qui propter eos, qui in hypocrisi veniunt, etiam a fratrum communicatione se abstinent. Datur autem intelligi, quod hujusmodi neque Apostolum Paulum recipiant. In ea enim epistola, quæ est ad Corinthios, de propheticis charismatibus diligenter locutus est, et scit viros et mulieres prophetantes. Per hæc igitur omnia peccantes in Spiritum Dei, in irremissibile incidunt peccatum. The name Ἄλογοι first occurs in *Epiphanius hær. LI. adv. Alogos*. Comp. especially the passage cap. 33, with corrected text. (Merkel S. 35 ff.): *ἐνοικησάντων γὰρ τούτων ἐκεῖσε (εἰς Θυάτειρα) καὶ τῶν κατὰ Φρύγας, [οἱ μὲν] δίκην λύκων ἁρπαζάντων τὰς διανοίας τῶν ἀκεραίων πιστῶν, μετήνεγκαν τὴν πᾶσαν πόλιν εἰς τὴν αὐτῶν αἵρεσιν· οἱ δὲ ἀρνούμενοι τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν, τοῦ λόγου τούτου εἰς ἀνατροπὴν, καπ' ἐκείνου καιροῦ ἐσπραπεύοντο.*

8 cf. *Irenæus* above, notes 6 and 7. The assertion of *Prædestinatus* hær. 26: Scripsit contra eos librum s. Soter Papa urbis (A. D. 161–170), is made improbable by the silence of Jerome, and is perhaps only a deduction from *Tertull.* adv. Prax. c. 1, præcessorum ejus auctoritates defendendo (the passage may be found below, § 57, note 3).

9 The Christians of Lugdunum and Vienna, in giving an account of the persecutions they had suffered, added their opinion concerning the Montanistic controversy, which Eusebius has unfortunately omitted (*Euseb.* V. 3, 2). *ἐκθέμενοι καὶ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς τελειωθέντων μαρτύρων διαφόρους ἐπιστολὰς, ἃς ἐν δεσμοῖς ἔτι ὑπάρχοντες, τοῖς ἐπ' Ἀσίας καὶ Φρυγίας ἀδελφοῖς διεχάραξαν· οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἐλευθέρῳ τῷ τότε Ῥωμαίων ἐπισκόπῳ, τῆς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν εἰρήνης ἕνεκα πρεσβεύοντες.* Comp. the preface of Maranus to the Opp. of Justin and the other Apologists, P. III. c. 14, § 2 seq. — Vid. § 57, § 48.

10 An instance below, § 52, note 31.

11 *Hieronymus Ep.* 27 (al. 54) *ad Marcellam:* Habent primos de Pepusa Phrygiæ Patriarchas: secundos, quos appellant Cenonas: atque ita in tertium i. e. pene ultimum locum Episcopi devolvuntur.

12 The last laws passed against them were by Justinian, A. D. 530 and 532. Vid. *Cod. Lib. I. Tit* 5. *L.* 18–21.

13 *Quintilliani. Priscillianistæ.* Ἀρτοτυρῖται. *Tascodrugitæ* (*passalorynchitæ*). *Tascodrocitæ* (Cod. Theod. XVI. 5, 10), *Ascodrogitæ* (Philastr. c. 75), *Ascodrogi*

CHAPTER THIRD.

INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCH.

§ 47.

The history of the internal relations of the orthodox church is intimately connected with that of its external relations. *Ecclesiastical literature*, which before had been confined to letters of exhortation and admonition (of which we have in this period a specimen in the letters of the good Dionysius, bishop of Corinth),[1] now took a wider range, especially in defending Christianity against the Heathen, and supporting orthodoxy against the Heretics. In doing this, however, it was unfortunately thought allowable, after the example of the Jews, to ascribe these productions to celebrated men long since dead, and thus the literature of the time is corrupted with a mass of spurious writings; the Heretics on their part not hesitating to make use of the same means in support of their cause.[2] On *the state of doctrines* in the church, also, its external relations could not fail to exert an influence, calling continually for the exhibition and support of particular dogmas. *The customs of the church* were necessarily in a great measure modified by them.

A very important circumstance is the conversion of several Platonic philosophers to Christianity, and, through their influence, the growing popularity of Platonism amongst the Christians.

For the rest, it ought to be observed that the Greek language was used almost exclusively as the language of the church.[3] Although there were many Latin translations of the Scriptures,[4] the writers even

---

(Theodos. jun. Novella III. in fine), *Ascodrutæ*, *Ascodrupitæ* (Theodoret. hær. fab. comp. I. 10), *Ascitæ* (Augustin. de hær. 62), are mere distortions of the name. cf. *Gothofredus* ad Novellum III. Theodosii jun. Out of these names, however, new heresies have been etymologically deduced.

1 Ἐπιστολαὶ καθολικαὶ to the churches in Rome, Nicomedia, Gnossus, Athens, Lacedæmon, Gortyna, and Pontus. Fragm. in Euseb. II, 25. IV, 23.

2 *Mosheim* de causis suppositorum librorum inter Christianos sæculi I. et II. (Dissertt. ad hist. eccl. pertin. Vol. I. p. 217 seq., takes a partial view of the subject. Comp. *C. I. Nitzsch* de testamentis XII. Patriarcharum comm. Viteberg. 1810. 4to. p. 1 seq.

3 Hence the custom of the Latin church, continued till into the Middle Ages, of requiring those who were baptized to recite the Symbolum, first in the Greek and then in the Latin language. cf. *Edm. Martene* de antiquis eccl. ritibus ed. 2. T. I. p. 88. *B. Gavanti* thesaurus sacr. rituum ed. C. M. Meratus. T. I. p. 42, and the other works cited in *Walchii* biblioth. symbol. vetus, p. 57.

4 *Augustin.* de doctr. christ. II. 11. Qui scripturas ex hebraica lingua in græcam verterunt, numerari possunt, latini autem interpretes nullo modo. Ut enim cuivis primis fidei temporibus in manus venit codex Græcus, et aliquan-

of the Western church wrote in Greek. But only where the language of the New Testament was a living tongue, does Christianity seem to have had any true life; in the West they did little more than adopt the productions of the East.

§ 48.

APOLOGIES FOR CHRISTIANITY ADDRESSED TO HEATHEN AND JEWS.

H. G. Tzschirners Geschichte der Apologetik. Leipzig. Th. 1. 1805. 8vo. Catalogue of the Apologetic writers in *Danz* de Eusebio Cæs. p. 93 seq. — The best edition of these writers is that of *Prudentius Maranus*. Paris. 1742. fol.

The most important of these are the Apologies, which are supposed (in part at least) to have been presented to the emperors.[1] Such are those of *Quadratus* and *Aristides*[2] (Euseb. iv. 3. Hieron. Cat. 19, 20), supposed to have been presented to Hadrian (A. D. 126), at Athens; and those of *Justin Martyr* († A. D. 166), addressed one to the emperor Antoninus Pius, and the other to Marcus Aurelius.[3] To this last also *Athenagoras* addressed his πρεσβεία περὶ Χριστιανῶν (Message concerning the Christians),[4] and *Melito*, bishop of Sardis, and

---

tulum facultatis sibi utriusque linguæ habere videbatur, ausus est interpretari. c. 16; in ipsis autem interpretationibus *Itala* cæteris præferetur; nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiæ.

1 First called in question by Bayle, s. v. *Athénagore*. Semler in the Introduction to Baumgartens Polemik. Bd. 2. S. 43. Henke I. 129.

2 The Apology of *Quadratus* was still extant in the beginning of the 7th century (Photius cod. 162.) It has been thought that *Ado* had the Apol. of *Aristides* (about A. D. 860) from the expressions used in his Martyrolog. ad d. 5 Nov.; but it does not follow, (as has been shown by *J. Dallæus* de scriptis, quæ sub Dionysii Areop. et Ignatii Antioch. nominibus circumferuntur, p. 90 seq.); and the account of *De la Guillotière* Athènes anciennes et nouvelles, Paris, 1676, of finding it still extant in the convent of Medelli, near Athens, is as little worthy of credit as all the rest of the narrative of this pretended tour. [See Spon voyage d'Italie et Dalm., Chateaubriand's Travels in Greece, Palestine, etc. 8vo. N. York. 1814. — Tr.]

3 The second and shorter of these Apologies of *Justin Martyr*, addressed to the Roman Senate, is commonly supposed to have been written in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, according to Pagi, Tillemont, and Mosheim; but according to Valesius, Longuerue, and Neander (K. G. I. III. 1113), also in the reign of Antoninus Pius. Apolog. primam ed. *J. E. Grabe*. Oxon. 1700. Alteram *H. Hutchin*, ib. 1703. Utramque *C. Gu. Thalemann*. Lips. 1755. 8vo. [Vid. *Bp. Kaye*, some Account of the Life and Writings of Justin Martyr. Camb. and Lond. 1829. 8vo. See article in Christian Examiner, for Nov. 1829. — Tr.]

4 Ed. *J. G. Lindner*. Langosal. 1774. 8vo. Cf. *Mosheim* de vera ætate Apologetici, quem Ath. pro Christ. scripsit diss. (in dissertt. ad hist. eccl. pertin. vol. I. p. 269 seq.) — περὶ ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν, ed. *L. A. Rechenberg*. Lips. 1685. 8vo. *Th. Adr. Clarisse* comm. de Athenagoræ vita et scriptis et ejus doctrina de relig. christ. Lugd. Bat. 1819. 4to. *Guerike* de schola, quæ Alexandriæ floruit, catechetica. P. I. p. 21 seq. P. II. p. 6, 50, 97, 403.

Claudius Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis,* their Apologies (Euseb. IV. 26; Hieron. Cat. 24, 26), now no longer extant. At the same time with these, appeared the apology of *Miltiades* (Euseb. V. 17; Hieron. Cat. 39); of *Theophilus*, bishop of Antioch, in three books, addressed to Autolycus;[5] of *Tatian*, λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας;[6] and perhaps also of *Hermias*, διασυρμὸς τῶν ἔξω φιλοσόφων;[7] and still earlier the ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Διόγνητον.[8] The aim of all these writers[9] is, to prove that there is no ground for the various accusations brought against Christianity, whilst they contrast its reasonableness with the inconsistency and immorality of Paganism. They show that its precepts correspond with those of the wisest amongst the philosophers, arguing at the same time, that these have drawn their wisdom from the Old Testament. In proving its divine origin they lay most stress on the prophecies of the Old Testament, the miracles of Jesus and the Apostles, the rapid spread of its doctrines, and the constancy of its followers; and end by demanding for the Christians the same protection which is extended to all other philosophical sects.

In defence of Christianity *against the Jews* we have two Dialogues, one in the time of Hadrian, ἀντιλογία Παπίσκου καὶ Ἰάσονος, which was afterwards, (though without reason,) ascribed to *Aristo*[10] *of*

---

* Fragments of this writer are found in the Catenæ patrum, especially in the Σειρὰ εἰς τὴν Ὀκτάτευχον. Lips. 1772. 2 voll. fol.

5 Ed. *J. C. Wolf.* Hamb. 1724. 8vo.

6 Ed. *W. Worth.* Oxon. 1700. 8vo.

7 Ed. *J. Ch. Dommerich.* Hal. 1764. 8vo.

8 Formerly attributed incorrectly to *Justin Martyr*. See *Tillemont* mémoires, T. II. p. 371, and C. D. Grosheim de epist. ad Diognetum comm. Lips. 1828, 4to., who supposes it to have been written about A. D. 132,—both published with annotations by *G. Böhl* Opuscula Patrum selecta. Berol. 1826. P. I. p. 109 seq.—It is possible that M. Minucius Felix also wrote in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, in which case he is the earliest Latin Apologist. He defended Christianity in a Dialogue called Octavius, extant only in a manuscript in the Royal Library at Paris, and at first supposed to be lib. octavus of Arnobius, on account of the title Octavius. ed. *D. Heraldus*. Paris. 1613. 4to. The opinion, which has for a long time prevailed, that Minucius belongs between Tertullian and Cyprian, A. D. 220–230, rests chiefly on the authority of Hieronymus, Catal. cap. 53: Tertullianus presbyter nunc demum primus post Victorem et Apollonium Latinorum ponitur; and he does not mention Minucius till the 58th chap. On the other hand, Blondell (de l'Eucharistie, p. 119), Dallæus (answered by Boyle, dictionn. s. v. *Fronton*), J. D. ab Hoven (p. 116), Oelrichs (de script. eccl. lat. p. 24), place him in the age of M. Aurelius, from internal grounds, namely, from the manner in which Fronto is referred to in cap. 9 (see above, § 38, note 12). But more lately this view has been adopted by Kestner (Agape. S. 356), H. Meier (comm. de Minucio Felice. Turici. 1824), Russwurm as above cited, and even by Tzschirner (Fall d. Heidenthums, I. 219), who had formerly defended the old opinion in his Gesch. d. Apologetik, I. 279.

9 *Ch. F. Eisenlohr* argumenta ab Apologetis sæc. II. ad confirmandam rel. christ. veritatem usurpata. Tubing. 1797. 4to. (recus. in *Pottii* sylloge comm. theologg. Vol. II. 114 seq.) Tzschirners Fall des Heidenthums, I. 237 ff.

10 First by Maximus († 662) commentar. ad Dionys. Areop. de myst. theol. c. 1. Those who preceded him suggest no such idea, though the dialogue is alluded to as early as *Celsus*, Orig. c. Cels. IV. p. 199. On the other hand, we

Pella, and the other *Justin Martyr's διάλογος πρὸς Τρύφωνα Ἰουδαῖον.*[11]

§ 49.

CONTROVERSY WITH HERETICS. — CATHOLIC CHURCH. — CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Of the earlier writers against heretics we have only a few fragments. These were *Agrippa Castor* (about the year 135), who wrote against Basilides; *Justin Martyr*, *Theophilus of Antioch*, *Rhodon*, *Philip*, bishop of Gortyna, and *Modestus*, who all wrote against Marcion; *Miltiades*, *Claudius*, *Apollinaris*, *Serapion*, bishop of Antioch, and *Apollonius*, who wrote against the Montanists. The work of *Irenæus* (bishop of Lyons A. D. 177-202), entitled ἔλεγχος καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως, in 5 books, is still extant, though mostly in an old Latin translation.[1]

The proof that the heretics had departed from the faith of the Apostles was drawn chiefly from the testimony of the Apostolical churches,[2] and the prevalence of the orthodox doctrines. By making

---

read, *Hieron. in quæst. in Genes.*: In principio fecit Deus cœlum et terram. Plerique existimant, sicut in altercatione quoque Jasonis et Papisci scriptum est, — — in Habræo haberi: In filio fecit Deus cœlum et terram. Quod falsum esse ipsius rei veritas comprobat. This could never have been written by a mere Jewish Christian like Aristo.

11 Ed. *Sam. Jebb.* Lond. 1719. 8vo. The doubts of its genuineness raised by *C. G. Koch* (Justini M. cum Tryph. Jud. dial. — suppositionis convictus. Kilon. 1700. 8vo. — The writings on the subject may be found in Walchii bibl. patrist. p. 216) and S. G. Lange (Ausführl. Gesch. d. Dogmen d. christl. Kirche. Th. I. Leipz. 1796. S. 137 ff.), are answered by *G. Münscher* an Dialogus cum Tryphone Justino M. recte adscribatur. Marb. 1799. 4to. (recus. in Commentatt. theoll. edd. *Rosenmüller*, *Fuldner*, et *Maurer*, T. I. P. II. p. 184 seq.)

1 Ed. *J. E. Grabe.* Oxon. 1702. fol. — *Renatus Massuet.* Paris. 1710. fol. The doubts of its authenticity raised by Semler (especially in the diss. in Tertull. in his edition of Tertull. Vol. V. p. 261, 300 seq.) are answered by *C. G. F. Walch* de αὐθεντίᾳ librorum Iren. adv. hær. in Nov. commentariis Soc. Scient. Gotting. T. V. [Vid. Murdock's Mosheim. Book I. cent. II. — Tr.]

2 *Tertullian.* de præscr. hær. c. 21: Quid autem (Apostoli) prædicaverint, id est, quid illis Christus revelaverit: et hic præscribam, non aliter probari debere, nisi per easdem ecclesias, quas ipsi Apostoli condiderunt, ipsi eis prædicando, tam viva (quod ajunt) voce, quam per epistolas postea. Si hæc ita sunt, constat proinde omnem doctrinam, quæ cum illis ecclesiis Apostolicis, matricibus, et originalibus fidei conspiret, veritati deputandam. c. 20: a quibus (ecclesiis) traducem fidei et semina doctrinæ cæteræ exinde ecclesiæ mutuatæ sunt et quotidie mutuantur, ut ecclesiæ fiant. c. 36: Percurre ecclesias apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ Apostolorum suis locis præsident, apud quas authenticæ literæ eorum recitantur, sonantes vocem et repræsentantes faciem uniuscujusque. Proxima est tibi Achaja? habes Corinthum. Si non longe es a Macedonia, habes Philippos, habes Thessalonicenses. Si potes in Asiam tendere, habes Ephesum. Si autem Italiæ adjaces, habes *Romam, unde nobis quoque auctoritas præsto est.* Ista quam felix ecclesia, cui totam doctrinam Apostoli cum sanguine suo profuderunt, ubi Petrus passioni dominicæ adæquatur, ubi Paulus Johannis exitu coronatur, ubi Apostolus Johannes, postea quam in oleum igneum demersus nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur. Videamus quid dixerit, quid

common cause in this matter, the churches which held to the ancient faith, came gradually to feel in some sort one, and thus was developed the idea of a Catholic church,[3] as opposed to and excluding all heretics; and this idea in its turn, as well as a common interest, led to a more and more intimate union, of which the Apostolic churches

---

cum Africanis quoque ecclesiis contesserarit, etc. (Comp. Neanders Antignosticus. S. 313 ff.) As the church of Rome was the only Apostolic church in the West, they naturally appealed to it chiefly. Iren. III. 3. Traditionem itaque Apostolorum in toto mundo manifestatam, in omni ecclesia adest perspicere omnibus, qui vera velint videre, et habemus annumerare eos, qui ab Apostolis instituti sunt Episcopi in ecclesiis et successores eorum usque ad nos, qui nihil tale docuerunt. — — — *Sed quoniam valde longum est*, in hoc tali volumine *omnium* Ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, *maximæ et antiquissimæ et omnibus cognitæ* gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro et Paulo Romæ fundatæ et constitutæ Ecclesiæ eam, quam habet ab Apostolis traditionem et annunciatam hominibus fidem, per successiones Episcoporum pervenientem usque ad nos, indicantes confundimus omnes eos, qui quoquo modo — — — præterquam oportet colligunt. *Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potiorem* (*al.* potentiorem) *principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea, quæ est ab Apostolis, traditio.* Irenæus wishes here to prove that the doctrine of the Catholic church is Apostolic, handed down uninterruptedly by the successors of the Apostles. As it would be too long an argument to attempt to prove this of each particular church, he confines himself to that of Rome; and concludes with providing against the possible objection that the tradition of the church of Rome may not perhaps be the same with that of the other churches. *Necesse est* (ἀνάγκη) must not be confounded with *oportet* (δεῖ), the former denoting a natural, and therefore necessary connexion, the latter a duty. *Principalitas* is not τὸ ἡγεμονικόν (principale), but αὐθεντία (thus in I. 35. cf. Epiph. hær. 35, 1. Theodoret. hær. fab. I. 15.) ἀρχὴ (II. 55. cf. Eph. i. 21), *primitiveness.* (Thus Adam before the fall is called by Iren. V. c. 14, principalis homo. *Tertull. de præscr.* 31: principalitatem veritati, posteritatem mendacitati deputandam). Thus the Greek text may have been: πρὸς ταύτην γὰρ ἐκκλησίαν διὰ τὴν ἱκανώτερον ἀρχὴν ἀνάγκη πᾶσαν συμβαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, τοῦτ' ἔστι τοὺς πανταχόθεν πιστούς, ἐν ᾗ ἀεὶ τοῖς (or αὐτοῖς τοῖς) πανταχόθεν συντετήρηται ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων παράδοσις. "For with this church all believers must of course agree, on account of its greater primitiveness." In the rest of the sentence, it seems probable that the Latin translator was misled as to the words τοῖς πανταχόθεν — supposing the Greek text to have been as above. These words he may have taken (and in so doing would have been grammatically correct) for ὑπὸ τῶν πανταχόθεν. "The Apostolic tradition having been therein preserved by believers from all parts," — referring to the many strangers who were always in Rome from all parts, to prove the agreement of the doctrines of this church with those of other churches. But it is more probable that Irenæus meant to say, "In which the Apostolic tradition has been preserved in correspondence with the believers of all other places." Hence he proceeds to adduce Clement's letter to the Corinthians, and Polycarp's stay at Rome, in proof of this correspondence. — Various other explanations of this passage may be found in *Grabe* and *Massuet* ad h. l. The latest writings on the subject are: *Paulus* in *Sophronizon*, Heft. 3. 1819. On the other side, Th. Katercamp über den Primat d. Apost. Petrus und s. Nachfolger. Münster. 1820. Comp. especially *Griesbach* de potentiore Eccl. Rom. principalitate comm. Jen. 1778. (recus. in ejusdem. Opuscul. acad. ed. Gabler. Vol. II. p. 136 seq.)

[3] The name first occurs in the *Epist. Eccl. Smyrn. de martyr. Polycarpi*, in *Eusebius* IV. c. 15, § 1. Cf. *Bingham* Origg. eccl. Lib. 1. c. 1. § 7. — Too much plan and concert is supposed by J. E. Ch. Schmidt Vers. über die Entstehung d. kath. K. in his Bibliothek f. Krit. u. Exeg. Bd. 2. S. 1 ff. Comp. Münschers Dogmengeschichte. Bd. 2. 3te Aufl. S. 379 ff.

formed the centre, though without exercising any absolute authority over the rest. In the Catholic church alone, true Christianity was to be found, and all without its pale were abandoned to the wrath of God.[4]

As the heretics appealed to Apostolical tradition, and even made use of pretended Apostolical writings in defence of their views, the attention of the churches was naturally awakened to the genuine writings of the Apostles scattered amongst them. The *letters* of the Apostles had always been read in the churches to which they were addressed, as well as in the neighbouring churches; but there was as yet no generally received collection of the *evangelical histories*, and such as there were (comprehending, besides our four canonical Gospels, the Gospel of the Hebrews, the Gospel of the Egyptians, &c.) were not read publicly. But now the churches were led by their new connexions and interests to communicate to each other the genuine writings of the Apostles, and thus in the first half of the 2d century the canon began to be formed, being distinguished into two parts, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, or τὸ εὐαγγελικὸν, and ὁ Ἀπόστολος or τὸ Ἀποστολικόν. Still in each church there continued to be other writings, which were held almost, if not altogether, in the same veneration with these ὁμολογούμενα, which were common to all.[5]

In opposition to the bold speculations of the Gnostics, the orthodox church was now led to establish a *regula fidei*, or rule of faith,[6] comprehending the doctrines which could be shown, in the consciousness of all Christians, as well as the writings of the Apostles, to be the basis of Christianity; and which, being themselves beyond all farther discussion, were to be distinctly recognised in all future speculations. To correspond with this, the originally simple conditions of the baptismal profession (σύμβολον)[7] were now extended; though the form was always lengthened or shortened to suit the particular views of different churches.[8]

---

4 Irenæus IV. 26, 33, and often. Tertullian de baptismo. 8vo. Ecclesia est *arca* figurata (cf. 1 Petr. iii. 20, 21.)

5 Comp. Gieseler über die Entstehung und die frühesten Schicksale der schriftl. Evangelien. Leipzig. 1818. S. 142 ff.; 179 ff.; 190 ff.

6 ὁ κανὼν ἐκκλησιαστικός, *Clemens. Alex.* Strom. VI. p. 803; ὁ κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας, Iren. I. 1, in fine. This rule of faith therefore was not a fixed rule handed down from the Apostles (cf. *Tertull.* de præscr. c. 13: Hæc regula a Christo, ut probabitur, instituta; c. 21, omnis docirina, quam ecclesiæ ab Apostolis, Apostoli a Christo, Christus a Deo accepit; c. 37, regula quam ecclesia ab Apostolis, Apostoli a Christo, Christus a Deo tradidit), nor was its authority placed above that of the Scriptures as asserted first by Lessing, and later by Delbrück Philip Melancthon der Glaubenslehrer. Bonn. 1826. S. 17 ff.

7 *Maximus Taurinensis* (about 430) homil. in symb. p. 239: Symbolum tessera est et signaculum, quo inter fideles perfidosque secernitur. To this *Tertullian* refers, de corona mil. c. 3: Ter mergitamur, amplius aliquid respondentes, quam Dominus in Evangelio determinavit.

8 cf. *Ch. G. F. Walchii* biblioth. symbolica vetus. Lemgov. 1770. 8vo. — *P. Kingii* hist. symboli Apostolici ex angl. serm. in latinum translata (by Olearius). Basil. 1750. 8vo. — *I. R. Kiesling* hist. de usu symbolorum. Lips. 1753. 8vo.

§ 50.

SPURIOUS WRITINGS. — CHILIASM.

In the character of the spurious writings of this period we can trace the prevailing features of the age; their purpose being either to encourage the persecuted, or to convince the unbelieving, and not unfrequently to give the sanction of antiquity to the tenets of a particular sect. In this way, the old spurious writings of the Jews were interpolated by the Christians, as the *book of Enoch*,* and the *4th book of Ezra*; † and others were new manufactured, as the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*,[1] the *Ἀναβατικὸν Ἠσαΐου*,[2] and the *Shepherd of Hermas* (vid. § 33). Of a different character were the *books of Hystaspes*,[3] and the *Sybilline prophecies*,[4] which, as well as the *Acts of Pilate* (vid. § 24, note 3), seem to have been chiefly intended for the Heathen.

---

* Extant in an Ethiopic translation, translated into English by *R. Laurence. The Book of Enoch the Prophet* etc. Oxford. 1821. 8vo. Comp. the article *Enoch* by Hoffmann in Ersch and Gruber's Encyclop. According to these two writers, the book was written in the beginning of the reign of Herod the Great. *De Sacy*, in the Journal des Savans, 1822, p. 593, points out the interpolations of the Christians therein.

† See the old Latin translation of this work in *J. A. Fabricii* Codex Pseudepigraphus Vet. Test. vol. II. p. 173. According to R. Merkel Vermischte Anmerk. aus der Philologie, Kritik, und Theologie. Leip. 1772, it was written in the time of Vespasian by a Jew, and interpolated by a Christian.

1 Concerning them see Beesenmeyer's Beiträge zur Gesch. d. Litteratur u. Reformation. Ulm. 1792. 8vo. S. 1 ff. *C. I. Nitzsch* de testamentis XII. Patriarcharum comm. Viteberg. 1810. 4to. To be found in *Fabricii* Cod. Pseudepigraphus V. T. vol. I. p. 496 seq.

2 Extant in an Ethiopic translation, Ascensio Isaiæ vatis æthiop. et lat. ed. *Rich. Laurence.* Oxon. 1819. 8vo. The copy of an old Latin translation, mentioned by *Sixtus Senensis* bibl. sancta, lib. II. p. 59, under the name of Visio admirabilis Isaiæ Proph. seems to be lost. The old Latin fragment, published by *Ang. Maius* Nova Collectio Scriptorum veterum, T. III. P. II. p. 238, may be found with corrections and annotations by Nitzsch in the Theol. Studien u. Kritiken zu 1830. Heft. 2. S. 209 ff. — Comp. Gesenius Comm. über den Jesaias, Th. 1. S. 45 ff.

3 *Ch. G. F. Walch* de Hystaspe ejusque vaticiniis apud Patres (Commentationes Soc. Reg. Gotting. vol. I. comm. hist. et philol. p. 3 seq.)

4 Sibyllinorum Oraculorum libb. VIII. ed. *Jo. Opsopœus.* Paris. 1589. ed. 2a. 1607. 8vo. *Servatius Gallæus.* Amst. 1689. 4to. *Gallandius*, in his Bibl. PP. T. I. p. 333 seq. In *Angeli Maii* Scriptorum veterum nova collectio, T. XII, 4 books are added, XI — XIV. — Sybilline oracles are cited by Justin Martyr, Apol. I. c. 20, 44. According to Celsus ap. Orig. c. Cels. VIII. p. 368, they were corrupted for their own purposes by a certain Christian party, whom he hence calls Sibyllistæ. — The Sibylline oracles now extant have been usually supposed to have originated in the second century, and ascribed to the Montanists; by many to Montanus himself. — (Casaubonus, Scaliger, Blondel, etc). Huetius ascribed them to the Gnostics, Cave to the Alexandrian Christians, Semler to Tertullian. Grotius held them to be Jewish productions interpolated by the Christians. G. J. Vossius first observed that they must be the work of many hands in different times. *Birger Thorlacius* (libri Sibyllistarum veteris ecclesiæ crisi quatenus mo-

In all these works the belief in the Millennium[5] is so evident, that no one can hesitate to consider it as universal in an age, when certainly such motives as it offered were not unnecessary to animate men to suffer for Christianity. This belief rested mainly on the book of Revelation. The Millennium was represented as the great Sabbath, which was very soon to begin (or as some thought, in 6000 years from the creation, Ps. xc. 4; 2 Petr. iii. 8, 9; Barnab. c. 15; Justin. dial. c. Tryph. c. 81; Iren. 5, 23), and to be ushered in by the resurrection of the dead. Till then the souls of the dead were to be kept in the world below,[6] and the opinion that souls were taken up into heaven before the resurrection was considered a Gnostic heresy.[7] The fancied enjoyments of the Millennium were in a high degree sensual and earthly.[8]

§ 51.

PLATONISM.

The Platonic-eclectic philosophers, many of whom were now converted to Christianity, retained, with their philosopher's cloak,[1] their philosophical turn of mind also, and many of their philosophical opinions. Instead of making any essential change in Christianity, as other philosophers had done, their aim seems to have been to give

---

numenta Christiana sunt, subjecti. Havn. 1815. 8vo., and in the Conspectus doctr. Christ. qualis in Sibyll. libris continetur. 1816,) supposes them to have been written between A. D 100 and 170, in Phrygia, and some of them by the Alexandrians. According to F. Bleek (in Schleiermacher's, de Wette's, und Lücke's theol. Zeitschrift. Heft. 1. S. 120 ff.) the 3d and 5th books consist chiefly of old Jewish oracles, the 4th book was written by a Christian about A. D. 80, and the three put together with various additions by an Egyptian Christian under Hadrian. The 8th book belongs to the time of Marcus Aurelius; the 6th and 7th to the 3d century; books 1 and 2 to the middle of the 5th century.

5 (H. Corodi's) krit. Geschichte d. Chiliasmus. Zürich. 3 Bde. 1781—83. 8vo. [Whitby on the millennium, at the end of the paraph. and comm. of the N. T. Lond. 1703. fol. Lardner's Cred. vols. IV., V., VII., IX. — Tr.]

6 Called by the Greek fathers Ἅιδης (the שְׁאוֹל of the Hebrews.) Cf. *Tertull. de anima*, c. 7: Si quid tormenti sive solatii anima præcerpit in carcere seu diversorio inferum: in igni, vel in sinu Abrahæ; probata erit corporalitas animæ. *Adv. Marcion.* IV. c. 34: Eam itaque regionem sinum dico Abrahæ, etsi non cœlestem, sublimiorem tamen inferis, interim refrigerium præbituram animabus justorum, donec consummatio rerum resurrectionem omnium plenitudine mercedis expungat. cf. *I. A. Dietelmaier*i hist. dogmatis de descensu Christi ad inferos. ed. 2. Altorf. 1762. 8vo. cap. I et II.

7 *Justin. dial. c. Tryph.* c. 80. *Tertull.* de resurr. carnis 43. See below, § 52, note 33.

8 *Justin.* l. c. according to Is. lxv. 17 seq. *Iren.* V. 25—36. *Tert.* adv. Marc. III. 24.

1 τρίβων, τριβώνιον, pallium. *C. G. F. Walchii* Antiquitates pallii philosophici vett. Christian. Jen. 1746. 8vo.

form, order, and connexion to the received Christian doctrines,[2] and keep a middle course between the various heresies; though they could seldom avoid some mixture of their philosophy.[3] The most eminent of these Christian philosophers were *Aristides*, *Justin Martyr*, *Athenagoras*, *Tatian*, *Pantænus* (vid. § 37), and *Maximus* (about the year 196.)[4] *Irenæus*, on the other hand, was an enemy to all philosophy. Their Platonism displayed itself chiefly in developing the theory of the Logos,[5] in which they followed Philo, making a distinction between the *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος* (dwelling in the thought of God) and *προφορικὸς* (brought forth, emitted).[6] The exclusive use of the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, and the prevailing method of allegorical interpretation, enabled them to cite from this source many passages favorable to their speculations (e. g. Ps. xxxiii. 6, xlv. 1, civ. 24, and even Gen. i. 1; especially Prov. viii. 22 seq.)

---

2 Thus Christianity became in their hands a complete system of philosophy. *Melito* ap. Euseb. IV. 26. § 4. *Keilii* opusc. II. p. 463 seq.

3 Justin. M. Apol. II. c. 13: *οὐκ ἀλλοτριά ἐστι τὰ Πλάτωνος διδάγματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστι πάντη ὅμοια, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων, Στωϊκῶν τε, καὶ ποιητῶν, καὶ συγγραφέων· ἕκαστος γάρ τις ἀπὸ μέρους τοῦ σπερματικοῦ θείου λόγου τὸ συγγενὲς ἐρῶν καλῶς ἐφθέγξατο. — — ὅσα οὖν σοφὰ πᾶσι καλῶς εἰρηται, ἡμῶν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἐστί.* The Platonism of the church fathers is acknowledged by *Dion. Petavius* dogm. theol. T. II. lib. I. c. 3. To this some have traced the doctrine of the trinity: (*Souverain*) le Platonisme dévoilé ou Essai touchant le verbe Platonicien. Cologne (Amsterdam) 1700, and *Jo. Clericus* epist. crit. et eccles. (artis criticæ vol. tertium. Amst. 1712), especially ep. VII. and VIII. Equally extravagant on the other side was the Jesuit *Baltus* défence des saints pères, accusés de Platonisme. Paris. 1711. 4to. — *Keil* de doctoribus veteris ecclesiæ, culpa corruptæ per Platonicas sententias theologiæ liberandis, comm. XXII. in ej. opusc. T. II. Lips. 1821. where may be found the references on this subject.

4 See his work *περὶ τῆς ὕλης*, Fragm. Euseb. præp. ev. VII. 22.

5 Ch. D. A. Martini Vers. einer pragm. Gesch. des Dogma v. d. Gottheit Christi in den vier ersten Jahrh. Th. 1. Rostock. 1800. 8vo.

6 Opinion of Irenæus on the subject, adv. hær. II. 48, 49: Si quis itaque nobis dixerit: Quomodo ergo Filius prolatus a Patre est? dicimus ei, quia prolationem istam, sive generationem, sive nuncupationem, sive adapertionem, aut quolibet quis nomine vocaverit generationem ejus inenarrabilem existentem nemo novit, non Valentinus, — — — neque Angeli, — — nisi solus qui generavit Pater, et qui natus est Filius. Inenarrabilis itaque generatio ejus cum sit, quicunque nituntur generationes et prolationes enarrare, non sunt compotes sui, ea quæ inenarrabilia sunt, enarrare promittentes. Quoniam enim ex cogitatione et sensu verbum emittitur, hoc utique omnes sciunt homines. (c. 49): non ergo magnum quid invenerunt, qui emissiones excogitaverunt, neque absconditum mysterium, si id quod ab omnibus intelligitur, transtulerunt in unigenitum Dei Verbum: et quem inenarrabilem et innominabilem vocant, hunc, quasi ipsi obstetricaverint, primæ generationis ejus prolationem et generationem enunciant, adsimilantes eum hominum verbo emissionis (*λόγῳ προφορικῷ*).

§ 52.

CUSTOMS OF THE CHURCH.

The prevailing disposition to trace a constant analogy between the Christian scheme and the Mosaic, which was considered as its model, naturally led to a comparison of those who officiated in the church with the Jewish priesthood,[1] and to the application to them of the same titles (Summus Sacerdos, Sacerdotes, Levitæ). As a body they were distinguished as peculiarly the κλῆρος sc. τοῦ θεοῦ,[2] and were called κληρικοί, by the Latins *ordo*,[3] (in contradistinction to the λαός, plebs, λαϊκοί); though the notion of a universal Christian priesthood was still retained.[4] The influence of the bishops increased naturally with the increasing frequency of Synods,[5] at

---

1 The whole Christian world is called (1 Peter ii. 5) ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον, (v. 9) βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα. The passage *Clem. Rom.* ep. I. c. 40, refers entirely to the Old Testament and does not belong here. On the other hand, in the Test. XII. Patr. there are traces of a peculiar priesthood. cf. Nitzsch de Test. XII. Patr. p. 19. So also in *Polycratis* Epist. ad Victorem, Euseb. V. 24. § 1: Ἰωάννης, — ὃς ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον φορήσας, although πέταλον (cf. Exod. xxix. 6; Lev. viii. 9) is used here only figuratively. cf. *J. F. Cotta* de lamina pontificali Apostoll. Joannis, Jacobi, et Marci. Tubing. 1755. 4to. The idea of a Christian priesthood is first distinctly found in Tertullian.

2 1 Pet. v. 3, all Christians are called κλῆροι. In a narrower sense, κλῆρος τῶν μαρτύρων in Epist. eccl. Vienn. et Lugdun. ap. Euseb. V. 1. § 4. The Christian clergy also cited, no doubt, in defence of their claims, the passages Num. xviii. 20; Deut. x. 9, xviii. 1, 2. In like manner they claimed, as early as the 4th century, the names *Christiani* and *Christianitas* as their peculiar right. (cf. Cod. Theod. V. 5. 2. XII. 1. 50, and 123, XII. 1. 123; *Du Fresne* glossar. ad. h. v.) cf. *J. H. Boehmer* de differentia inter Clericos et Laicos diss. (XII. dissertt. juris eccl. ant. ad Plinium etc. p. 340 seq.). A different view is taken by Neander Denkwürdigkeiten, Bd. 1. S. 184; Kirchengesch. Bd. 1. Abth. 1.

3 Taken from the municipal officers, who, according to the analogy of the Roman senate were called *Ordo Decurionum* or *Ordo*, in contradistinction to the *Plebeii*. cf. Digest. Lib. L. Tit. 2, de Decurionibus.

4 *Iren.* IV. 20: Omnes enim justi sacerdotalem habent ordinem. *Tertullian. de exhortat. castitatis*, c. 7: Nonne et laici sacerdotes sumus? — Differentiam inter ordinem et plebem constituit ecclesiæ auctoritas, et honor per ordinis consessum sanctificatus. *Adeo ubi ecclesiastici ordinis non est consessus, et offers et tinguis, et sacerdos es tibi solus.* Sed ubi tres, ecclesia est, licet laici.— Igitur si habes jus sacerdotis in temet ipso, ubi necesse est, habeas oportet etiam disciplinam sacerdotis, ubi necesse sit habere jus sacerdotis. (cf. *De corona mil.* c. 3. See Neander's Antignosticus, S. 154.) The literal interpretation of this discourse by *Nic. Rigaltius* (Tertullian. opp. observ. 19) was opposed by *Gabr. Aubespine* (Albaspinæus) de l'eucharistie. Controversy concerning *offerre* in this passage (see below, note 13), and de jure laicorum sacerdotali. For Rigaltius (Hugo Grotius) De administratione Cœnæ, ubi Pastores non sunt. 1638., Claudius Salmasius, and others: on the other side, D. Petavius, H. Dodwell, and others. The history of the controversy in *J. F. Buddei* institut. theol. dogmat. (Lips. 1723), p. 1486 seq. cf. *Boehmer* l. c. p. 272 seq. 485 seq. Neanders Denkw. Bd. 1. S. 179 ff.

5 The first were held against the Montanists (160 — 170), Euseb. V. 16. About

which they represented their churches (παροικίαι).[6] Country-churches, which had grown up around some city, seem with their bishops (χωρεπίσκοποι)[7] to have been usually in a certain degree under the authority of the mother-church. With this exception, all the churches were alike independent, though some were especially held in honor on such grounds as their Apostolical origin, or the importance of the city in which they were situated. Many such circumstances combined to give the church of Rome a particular preëminence, especially in the West.[8]

Public worship was extremely simple. Without temples, or altars, or images, the Christians assembled in private houses, and, in time of persecution, in remote and unfrequented places,[9] and sometimes in the night; always in the night before Easter.[10] They brought with them voluntary offerings, from which was taken what was necessary for the Lord's Supper (εὐχαριστία), and the Agape or love-feast, which was

---

A. D. 200, a synod was held in Carthage, under Agrippinus. See § 37, note 2. *Tertull. de jejun.* 13: Aguntur præterea per Græcias illa certis in locis concilia ex universis ecclesiis, per quæ et altiora quæque in commune tractantur, et ipsa repræsentatio totius nominis Christiani magna veneratione celebratur. Imitations perhaps of the Amphictyons, which still continued (Pausan. X, 8.) Comp. Ueber den Ursprung der Kirchenversammlungen, in (J M. Abele) Magazin für Kirchenrecht u. KG. Leipz. 1778. St. 2. S. 479 ff., W L. C. Ziegler in Henkes neuem Magazin für Religionsphilosophie &c. I. 125 ff.

6 *Irenæus* in Euseb. V. 24. § 5. cf. *Clemens Rom.* init. epist. I: Ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ παροικοῦσα Ῥώμην τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ παροικούσῃ Κόρινθον. So also *Epist. Eccl. Smyrn.* Euseb. IV. 15. § 1.

7 Comp. *Bingham* 1, p. 192 seq. Planck I. S. 73 ff. In Africa, where Suburban bishops were particularly numerous, they were in no wise distinguished from the other bishops, not even in name. Cf. *St. A. Morcelli* Africa Christiana (PP. III. Brixiæ. 1816. 4to.). P. I. p. 43.

8 Amongst these were the frequent contributions to the support of other churches. *Dionys. Corinth. ad Rom. epist* (ap. Euseb. IV 23): ἐξ ἀρχῆς γὰρ ὑμῖν ἔθος ἐστὶ τοῦτο, πάντας μὲν ἀδελφοὺς ποικίλως εὐεργετεῖν, ἐκκλησίαις τε πολλαῖς ταῖς κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν ἐφόδια πέμπειν· ὧδε μὲν τὴν τῶν δεομένων πενίαν ἀναψύχοντας, ἐν μετάλλοις δὲ ἀδελφοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν ἐπιχορηγοῦντας.

9 *Celsus* ap. Orig. c. Cels. VIII. p. 389: βωμοὺς καὶ ἀγάλματα καὶ νεὼς ἱδρύσθαι φύγουσι. *Minucii Felicis Octavius*, c. 10: cur nullas aras habent, templa nulla, nulla nota simulacra? — As early as the end of the 2d century particular buildings seem to have been devoted exclusively to public worship. *Tertull. de idolol.* c. 7: ab idolis in ecclesiam venire, de adversarii officina in domum Dei venire. Comp. *Chron. Edessen.* above, § 37, note 3. The name ἐκκλησία is often used even so early of the assembling places, e. g. *Tertull. de cor. mil.* c. 3: see below, note 20. *Clem. Alex. Strom.* VII. p. 846.

10 *Tertull. ad uxor.* II. c. 4: Quis (infidelis maritus uxorem Christianam) nocturnis convocationibus, si ita oportuerit, a latere suo adimi libenter feret? Quis denique solemnibus Paschæ abnoctantem securus sustinebit? Probably the notion was even then common, which Jerome mentions, *Comm. in Matth. lib. IV.* ad Matth. xxv. 6: Traditio Judæorum est, Christum media nocte venturum in similitudinem Ægypfii temporis, quando Pascha celebratum est, et exterminator venit, et Dominus super tabernacula transiit, et sanguine agni postes nostrarum frontium consecrati sunt. Unde reor et traditionem Apostolicam permansisse, ut in die vigiliarum Paschæ ante noctis dimidium populos dimittere non liceat, exspectantes adventum Christi. Et postquam illud tempus transierit, securitate præsumta, festum cuncti agunt diem.

still therewith connected.[11] The remainder was given to the poor, and the clergy, for whose support there was besides this a monthly contribution.[12] All these were considered as offerings to God, and especially the bread and wine, which was consecrated by the prayers of the bishop. Hence the same expressions (*προσφέρειν, προσφορά*, offerre, oblatio) are applied to them all indiscriminately, and the same allusions to sacrifices, tithes, and first-fruits.[13] Still it was not forgotten that the prayer was the true offering to God, and not the gifts. The Eucharist was considered the symbol of the intimate communion of the church with Christ and one another. It was sent to the ab-

---

11 Not always indeed on account of the persecutions. According to *Justin. Apol.* I. c. 65, the Eucharist was sometimes celebrated alone; according to *Tertull. de corona mil.* c. 3, even antelucanis cœtibus. Concerning the manner of public worship, cf. *Justinus* l. c. cap. 65 – 67. *Tertull.* Apolog. c. 39.

12 *Tertull.* Apolog. c. 39: modicam unusquisque stipem menstrua die, vel quum velit, et si modo velit, et si modo possit, apponit. Hence *Cyprian. Ep.* 28, and 34, divisiones mensurnæ. sportulæ Presbyterorum. *Ep.* 66; sportulantes fratres. Ziegler Ueber die Einkünfte des Clerus u. d. Kirche in den ersten drei Jahrh. in Henkes Neuem Magazine für Religionsphilosophie, &c. Bd. 4. S. 1 ff.

13 *Constitutt. Apost.* II. c. 25: *αἱ τότε θυσίαι, νῦν εὐχαὶ, καὶ δεήσεις, καὶ εὐχαριστίαι· αἱ τότε ἀπαρχαὶ, καὶ δεκάται, καὶ ἀφαιρέματα, καὶ δῶρα, νῦν προσφοραὶ, αἱ διὰ τῶν ὁσίων ἐπισκόπων προσφερόμεναι κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀποθανόντος.* *Origenes* hom. XI. in Num.; Primitias omnium frugum, omniumque pecudum, sacerdotibus lex mandat offerri. — Deo enim offerri dicit, quod sacerdotibus datur. cf. *Constitt. Apost.* VII. c. 30, c. 31. *Cyprian.* de opere et eleemosynis (ed. Rigalt. p. 259) says to a certain rich woman: Locuples et dives es, et dominicum celebrare te credis, quæ corbonam omnino non respicis; quæ in dominicum sine sacrificio venis; quæ partem de sacrificio, quod pauper obtulit, sumis? *Justin M.* dial. c. Tryph. c. 116: *ἡμεῖς — ἀρχιερατικὸν τὸ ἀληθινὸν γένος ἐσμὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ. — οὐ δείκνυται δὲ παρ' οὐδενὸς θυσίας ὁ Θεὸς, εἰ μὴ διὰ τῶν ἱερέων αὐτοῦ.* c. 117: *Πάσας οὖν διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τούτου θυσίας, ἃς παρέδωκεν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς γίνεσθαι, τουτέστιν ἐπὶ τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου τὰς ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ τῆς γῆς γινομένας ὑπὸ τῶν Χριστιανῶν, προλαβὼν ὁ Θεὸς, μαρτυρεῖ εὐαρέστους ὑπάρχειν αὐτῷ.* cf. *cap.* 41. *Irenæus* IV. c. 32: Sed et suis discipulis dans consilium, primitias Deo offerre ex suis creaturis, non quasi indigenti, sed ut ipsi nec infructuosi, nec ingrati sint, eum, qui ex creatura est panis, accepit, et gratias egit, dicens: *Hoc est corpus meum.* Et calicem similiter, qui est ex ea creatura, quæ est secundum nos, suum sanguinem confessus est: et novi Testamenti novam docuit oblationem, quam Ecclesia ab Apostolis accipiens, in universo mundo offert Deo, ei qui alimenta nobis præstat, primitias suorum munerum in novo Testamento, de quo in XII. Prophetis Malachias sic præsignificavit (*Mal.* i. 10, 11), etc. In accordance with this, we read even now in the *Canon Missæ*, which is a compilation from various times: Te igitur, clementissime pater, — supplices rogamus ac petimus, uti accepta habeas ac benedicas hæc dona, hæc munera, hæc sancta sacrificia illibata, etc. Comp. the description in *Justini* Apol. I. c. 65: *ἔπειτα προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος, καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος· καὶ οὗτος λαβὼν, αἶνον καὶ δόξαν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων — ἀναπέμπει, καὶ εὐχαριστίαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ καταξιῶσθαι τούτων παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πολὺ ποιεῖται. Οὗ συντελέσαντος τὰς εὐχὰς καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν, πᾶς ὁ παρὼν λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ λέγων ἀμήν.* — *ἐπευφημήσαντος παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, οἱ καλούμενοι παρ' ἡμῖν διάκονοι διδόασιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι.* cf. *C. M. Pfaffii* diss. de oblatione veterum eucharistica in his Syntagma dissertt. theologg. Stuttg. 1720.

sent,[14] and reserved by those who partook of it in public to be eaten also at home.[15]

Baptism was preceded by instruction,[16] fasts, and prayer. The baptism of infants was not a universal custom, and was sometimes even expressly discountenanced.[17] As all the followers of Christ were supposed to be engaged in a constant warfare against the world and the devil,[18] they resorted frequently to exorcism, as a defence against the machinations of evil spirits.[19] It is probable that this was now done in the case of those, who renounced the prince of this world in preparation for baptism.[20] Towards the end of the 2d century a variety of new ceremonies were introduced into the rite itself.[21]

---

14 Cf. *Justinus* l. c.: *Irenæus* ap. *Euseb.* V. 24, § 5: The presbyters of one church ἔπεμπον εὐχαριστίαν to those of another.

15 *Tertull. ad uxorem* II. c. 5. *De orat.* c. 19. [Bingham l. xv. c. 4. Kaye on Tertullian, p. 457. — Tr.]

16 Concerning the subjects of instruction (Symbolum), see above, § 49. note 7.

17 *Tertull. de baptismo*, c. 18: Itaque pro cujusque personæ conditione ac dispositione, etiam ætate, cunctatio baptismi utilior est: præcipue tamen circa parvulos. Quid enim necesse est, sponsores etiam periculo ingeri? quia et ipsi per mortalitatem destituere promissiones suas possunt, et proventu malæ indolis falli. Ait quidem Dominus: *Nolite illos prohibere ad me venire* (Matth. xix. 14). Veniant ergo, dum adolescunt, veniant dum discunt, dum, quo veniant, docentur: fiant Christiani, quum Christum nosse potuerint. *Quid festinat innocens ætas ad remissionem peccatorum?* Cautius agetur in sæcularibus, ut cui substantia terrena non creditur, divina credatur. Norint petere salutem, ut petenti dedisse videaris. Non minore de causa innupti quoque procrastinandi, in quibus tentatio præparata est tam virginibus per maturitatem, quam viduis per vagationem, donec aut nubant, aut continentiæ corroborentur. Si qui pondus intelligant baptismi, magis timebunt consecutionem quam dilationem: fides integra secura est de salute. Cf. *William Wall*, History of Infant Baptism. 3rd ed. 2 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1720. Vol. I. p. 38 seq.

18 *Tertull. ad Martyres*, c. 3: Vocati sumus ad militiam Dei vivi jam tunc, cum in sacramenti verba respondimus, etc. *De corona mil.* c. 11.

19 *Tertull. de idololatr.* c. 11, of the Christian thurarius: Qua constantia exorcizabit alumnos suos (i. e. ironically, the Demons), quibus donium suam cellariam præstat? *De cor. militis*, c. 11, of the Christian soldier: Quos interdiu exorcismis fugavit, noctibus defensabit, incumbens et requiescens super pilum, quo perfossum est latus Christi?

20 *Barnabas Epist.* c. 16: Πρὸ τοῦ ἡμᾶς πιστεῦσαι τῷ θεῷ, ἦν ἡμῶν τὸ κάτοικητήριον τῆς καρδίας φθαρτὸν καὶ ἀσθενὲς — οἶκος δαιμόνων, διὰ τὸ ποιεῖν ὅσα ἦν ἐναντία τῷ θεῷ. From this view the use of exorcism in baptism followed naturally.

21 As late as *Justinus*, Apol. I. c. 61, the ceremony of baptism was still very simple. Otherwise in *Tertull. de cor. mil.* c. 3: Aquam adituri, ibidem, sed et aliquanto prius in ecclesia, sub antistitis manu contestamur, nos renuntiare diabolo et pompæ et angelis ejus. Dehinc ter mergitamur, amplius aliquid respondentes, quam dominus in Evangelio determinavit. Inde suscepti lactis et mellis concordiam prægustamus (qua infantamur, *adv. Marc.* I. c. 14): exque ea die lavacro quotidiano per totam hebdomadam abstinemus. It has been thought that the last named rite was taken from the Heathen mysteries, vid. *Mosheim* de rebus Christ. ante Const. M. p. 321. Neanders Antignosticus. S. 149 ff. — *Tertull. de baptismo*, c. 7: Exinde egressi de lavacro perungimur benedicta unctione (χρίσματι) de pristina disciplina, qua ungi oleo de cornu in sacerdotium solebant. (According to *Thilo*, Acta Thomæ, p. 177, this anointing was of

Marriages were announced to the church by the bishop, and with this was naturally connected his blessing on the union.[22] Second marriages were by many condemned in any case,[23] and began to be universally considered inadmissible in the clergy.[24] The attempt of the Montanists to prohibit them entirely, however, met with great opposition. Fasting (which was considered an appropriate preparation for prayer) and celibacy were held in high esteem, but were entirely matter of choice.[25] Though many of the Christians imposed on themselves certain restraints (ἀσκηταὶ),[26] all forced and extravagant self-inflictions were disapproved.[27] The only custom of the kind, which seems to have been universal, was the observance of a fast during the passion-week; though even this was observed in different ways. For voluntary fasts they commonly made choice of

---

Gnostic origin.) *cap.* 8: Dehinc manus imponitur, per benedictionem advocans et invitans spiritum sanctum (χειροθεσία). Neanders Kirchengesch. Bd. 1. Abth. 2. S. 558 ff.

22 *Ignat. Epist. ad Polycarp.* § 5. *Tertull. ad uxor.* II. c. 9: Unde sufficiam ad enarrandam felicitatem ejus matrimonii, quod ecclesia conciliat, et confirmat oblatio, et obsignatum angeli renunciant, pater rato habet? *De Pudicit.* c. 4: Penes nos occultæ quoque conjunctiones, i. e. non prius apud Ecclesiam professæ, juxta mœchiam et fornicationem judicari periclitantur. Concerning the marriages of the early Christians, vid. (Abele) Mag. f. Kirchenrecht, Bd. 1. S. 261 ff. Münters Sinnbilder d. alten Christen, Heft 2. S. 112 ff.

23 *Athenagoras* deprec. c. 28. ὁ δεύτερος (γάμος) εὐπρεπής ἐστι μοίχεια. On the other hand, *Hermæ Past.* lib. I. mand IV. 4: Si vir vel mulier alicujus decesserit, et nupserit aliquis illorum, numquid peccat? Qui nubit non peccat, inquit, sed si per se manserit, magnum sibi conquirit honorem apud Dominum. So too *Clem. Alex.* Strom. III. p. 548, ed. Potter. cf. Cotelerius ad Hermæ l. c.

24 *Tertull. ad uxorem* I. 7, disciplina ecclesiæ et præscriptio Apostoli — — digamos non sinit præsidere. Still *de monogam.* 12: Quot enim et digami præsident apud vos, insultantes utique Apostolo. (From 1 Tim. iii. 2.) Tertullian read also in Lev. xxi.: Sacerdotes mei non plus nubent (de exhort. castit. 7). Comp. *Heydenreich's* Pastoralbriefe Pauli. Bd. 1. S. 166 ff.

25 Even for the clergy *G. Calixti* de conjug. clericorum liber. Helmst. 1631. 4to. iterum ed. *H. Ph. C. Henke*, P. II. ibid. 1783. 4to. p. 181 seq. Theiner Einführung der erzwung. Ehelosigkeit bei den Geistl. Bd. 1. S. 69.

26 This name was first applied to the athletæ (Plato de republ. III. p. 297), and afterwards by Philo to the virtuous wise. So also the Heathen philosophers (*Arrian.* diss. in Epict. III. c. 12, περὶ ἀσκήσεως. *Artemidorus*, about A. D. 100, says, Oneirocrit. IV. c. 33, of a certain philosopher, Alexander: ἔμελε δὲ αὐτῷ ὄντι ἄνδρι ἀσκητῇ οὔτε γάμου, οὔτε κοινωνίας, οὔτε πλούτου.) *Athenagoræ* deprec. c. 28: Εὕροις δ' ἂν πολλοὺς τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν καὶ ἄνδρας καὶ γυναῖκας καταγηράσκοντας ἀγάμους, ἐλπίδι τοῦ μᾶλλον συνίσεσθαι τῷ θεῷ. *Tertull. de cultu fœminar.* II: Non enim et multi ita faciunt, et se spadonatui obsignant propter regnum Dei (cf. Matth. xix. 12) tam fortem et utique permissam voluptatem sponte ponentes? (*continentes*, ἐγκρατεῖς, cf. de vel. virg. 3). Numquid non *aliqui* ipsam Dei creaturam sibi interdicunt, *abstinentes* vino et animalibus esculentis, quorum fructus nulli periculo aut sollicitudini adjacent, sed humilitatem animæ suæ in victus quoque castigatione Deo immolant? cf. *Sal. Deyling exerc. de Ascetis veterum*, in ejusd. *Observatt. sacr.* lib. III.

27 *Dionys. Corinth.* (ap. Euseb. IV. 23), in his letter to the bishop Pinytus, exhorts him, μὴ βαρὺ φορτίον ἐπάναγκες τὸ περὶ ἁγνείας τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐπιτιθέναι, τῆς δὲ τῶν πολλῶν καταστοχάζεσθαι ἀσθενείας. — *Ex epist. Eccl. Vienn. et Lugd.* ap. *Euseb.* V. 3: Ἀλκιβιάδου γάρ τινος ἐξ αὐτῶν, πάνυ αὐχμηρὸν βιοῦντος βίον, καὶ

Wednesday or Friday.[28] Both Sunday and the Sabbath were observed as festivals; the latter, however, without the Jewish superstitions therewith connected. In the celebration of the Passover there was a difference between the churches of Asia Minor and the Western churches. The former observed the day on which our Lord instituted the Holy Supper, the 14th Nisan, whilst the latter observed the following Friday, as the day of our Saviour's death, and therefore the true Passover.[29] On occasion of Polycarp's visit to Rome (about A. D. 160), he held a conference on this subject with the Roman bishop, Anicetus (epist. Irenæus ap. Euseb. 5, 24). Each remained fixed in his own opinion, though they separated in perfect amity. In the mean time the subject began to be discussed in Asia Minor itself. About the year 170 a violent controversy was carried on at Laodicea, concerning the celebration of Easter, and several polemical writings appeared. The Asiatic custom in this respect being attacked by *Claudius Apollinaris* (fragm. in Chronic. pasch. præf. p. 6, 7), and defended by *Melito* (Euseb. 4, 26. cf. epist. Polycratis apud eund. 5, 24.)

The punishment of open offences was exclusion from the church, and a public penance was the indispensable condition of readmit-

---

μηδενὸς ὅλως τὸ πρότερον μεταλαμβάνοντος, ἀλλ' ἢ ἄρτῳ μόνῳ καὶ ὕδατι χρωμένου, πειρωμένου τε καὶ ἐν τῇ εἱρκτῇ οὕτω διάγειν, Ἀττάλῳ μετὰ τὸν πρῶτον ἀγῶνα, ὃν ἐν τῷ ἀμφιθεάτρῳ ἤνυσεν, ἀπεκαλύφθη, ὅτι μὴ καλῶς ποιοίη ὁ Ἀλκιβιάδης, μὴ χρώμενος τοῖς κτίσμασι τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἄλλοις τύπον σκανδάλου ὑπολειπόμενος. πεισθεὶς δὲ Ἀλκιβιάδης πάντων ἀνέδην μετελάμβανε καὶ εὐχαρίστει τῷ Θεῷ.

28 *Stationes*, comp. Hermæ Pastor III. Sim. 5, and Fabricius ad h. l. Cod. Apocr. N. T. III. p. 928. *Tertull. de jejun.* c. 2: Certe in evangelio illos dies jejuniis determinatos putant (Psychici), in quibus ablatus est sponsus (Matth. ix. 15): et hos esse jam solos legitimos jejuniorum christianorum. (*De orat.* 14: die *Paschæ* communis et quasi publica jejunii religio est) — sic et Apostolos observasse, nullum aliud imponentes jugum certorum et in commune omnibus obeundorum jejuniorum: proinde nec stationum, quæ et ipsæ suos quidem dies habeant, quartæ feriæ et sextæ, passim tamen currant, neque *sub lege præcepti*, neque ultra supremam diei, quando et orationes fere hora nona concludat, de Petri exemplo, quod actis refertur. (*De orat.* 14, statio de militari exemplo nomen accipit: nam et militia Dei sumus). C. 13: Bene autem, quod et Episcopi universæ plebi mandare jejunia assolent — — ex aliqua sollicitudinis ecclesiasticæ causa. — *Irenæus ad Victorem ap. Euseb.* V. 24, 4: οὐδὲ γὰρ μόνον περὶ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐστὶν ἡ ἀμφισβήτησις, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τοῦ εἴδους αὐτοῦ τῆς νηστείας· οἱ μὲν γὰρ οἴονται μίαν ἡμέραν δεῖν αὐτοὺς νηστεύειν, οἱ δὲ δύο, οἱ δὲ καὶ πλείονας, οἱ δὲ τεσσαράκοντα ὥρας ἡμερινάς τε καὶ νυκτερινάς, αἷς συμμετροῦσι τὴν ἡμέραν αὐτῶν. Cf. *Jo. Dallæus* de jejuniis et quadragesima. Daventr. 1654. 8vo.

29 The older historians mistook the Passover for the festival of the resurrection. Different opinions of the moderns, *Gabr. Daniel* de la discipline des Quartodécimans pour la célébration de la Pacque (Recueil de divers Ouvrages Philos., théolog., historiques par le *P. Daniel*. Paris. 1724. 4to. p. 473 seq.). *Christ. Aug. Heumann* vera descriptio priscæ contentionis inter Romam et Asiam de vero Paschate (in *ejusd.* Nova sylloge dissertatt. I. 156 seq.). *J. L. Mosheim* de reb. Christ. ante Const. M. p. 435 seq. Neander im Kirchenhist. Archiv. 1823. Heft 2. S. 90 ff. Kirchengesch. Bd. 1. Abth. 2. S. 518 ff. The most correct view that of Socrates hist. eccl. V. 22: οὐδαμοῦ τοίνυν ὁ Ἀπόστολος, οὐδὲ τὰ εὐαγγέλια ζυγὸν δουλείας τοῖς τῷ κηρύγματι προσελθοῦσιν ἐπέθηκαν· ἀλλὰ τὴν ἑορτὴν τοῦ πάσχα καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἑορτὰς τιμᾷν, τῇ εὐγνωμοσύνῃ τῶν εὐεργετηθέντων κατέλιπον· — — σκοπὸς μὴν οὖν γέγονε τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις, οὐ περὶ ἡμερῶν ἑορταστικῶν νομοθε-

tance.[30] In the Western church it was not uncommon, after the example of the Montanists, to exclude for ever from the church those who had been guilty of incontinence, murder, or idolatry;[31] in the East they were allowed to do penance once, but only once.[32]

All who had endured persecution for their faith were held in high esteem. A martyr's death, like the rite of baptism, was supposed to cancel all sins (Luke xii. 50; Mark x. 39, lavacrum sanguinis, τὸ βάπτισμα διὰ πυρός), to supply the place of baptism (for which they cited Matth. x. 39), and at once to secure admittance into the presence of the Lord in paradise (Math. v. 10–12, hence natales, natalitia martyrum).[33] The confessors also [those who had confessed their faith, but escaped with their lives.—Tr.] were considered chosen members of Christ. (Matth. x. 32; I Tim. vi. 12, 13). They were

---

τεῖν, ἀλλὰ βίον ὀρθὸν καὶ τὴν θεοσέβειαν εἰσηγήσασθαι· ἐμοὶ δὲ φαίνεται, ὅτι ὥσπερ ἄλλα πολλὰ κατὰ χώρας συνήθειαν ἔλαβεν, οὕτω καὶ ἡ τοῦ πάσχα ἑορτὴ παρ' ἑκάστοις ἐκ συνηθείας τινὸς ἰδιάζουσαν ἔσχε τὴν παρατήρησιν, διὰ τὸ μηδένα τῶν Ἀποστόλων, ὡς ἔφην, μηδενὶ νενομοθετηκέναι περὶ αὐτῆς.

30 ἐξομολόγησις. *Iren.* I. c. 9, says of a female penitent, αὐτὴ τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον ἐξομολογουμένη διετέλεσε πενθοῦσα καὶ θρηνοῦσα. *Tertull. de pœnit.* c. 9: Exomologesis —, qua delictum Domino nostrum confitemur: non quidem ut ignaro, sed quatenus satisfactio confessione disponitur, confessione pœnitentia nascitur, penitentia Deus mitigatur. Itaque exomologesis prosternendi et humilificandi hominis disciplina est, conversationem injungens misericordiæ illicem. De ipso quoque habitu atque victu mandat, sacco et cineri incubare, corpus sordibus obscurare, animum mœroribus dejicere; illa, quæ peccavit, tristi tractatione mutare. Cæterum pastum et potum pura nosse; non ventris scilicet, sed animæ causa. Plerumque vero jejuniis preces alere, ingemiscere, lachrymari, et mugire dies noctesque ad dominum Deum tuum, presbyteris advolvi, et caris Dei adgenicular, omnibus fratribus legationes deprecationis suæ injungere. — Inquantum non peperceris tibi, intantum tibi Deus, crede, parcet.

31 *Cyprian. Epist.* 52: Apud antecessores nostros quidam de Episcopis istic in provincia nostra dandam pacem mœchis non putaverunt, et in totum pœnitentiæ locum contra adulteria clauserunt. Non tamen a Coëpiscoporum suorum collegio recesserunt, aut catholicæ Ecclesiæ unitatem vel duritiæ et censuræ suæ obstinatione ruperunt; ut, quia apud alios adulteris pax dabatur, qui non dabat, de ecclesia separaretur. Manente concordiæ vinculo et perseverante Catholicæ Ecclesiæ individuo sacramento, actum suum disponit et dirigit unusquisque Episcopus, rationem propositi sui Domino redditurus. Though this severity was afterwards relaxed in the case of the *mœchi* (see below § 57, note 4,) with regard to the two other crimes, the Montanistic principle was still retained: quod neque idololatriæ neque sanguini pax ab Ecclesiis redditur. *Tert. de pudic.* c. 12. In the passage de pœnit. c. 7 seq., therefore, where he says, that even such penitents may find forgiveness, he probably takes for granted that they remain penitents their lives long. The word *absolvi*, cap. 10 (comp. Neanders Antignosticus, S. 221.) must refer to the divine forgiveness of sin, as this expression was not applied to the acts of the church, but the words *reconciliare, pacem accipere, ad communionem venire.*

32 *Hermæ Pastor*, II. Mand. 4, § 1: Servis enim Dei pœnitentia una est. § 3, in opposition to the doctrine of the Montanists: Quod alia pœnitentia non est nisi illa, cum in aquam descendimus, et accipimus remissionem peccatorum. So too *Clemens Alex. Strom.* II. c. 13, p. 459 seq. Cf. *Bingham lib.* XVIII. c. 4. Vol. VIII. p. 156 seq.

33 *Tertull. de resurr. carnis*, 43. Nemo enim peregrinatus a corpore statim immoratur penes Dominum, nisi ex martyrii prærogativa, scilicet paradiso non inferis diversurus. — *Clemens Alex. Strom.* IV. p. 596. Ἔοικε οὖν τὸ μαρτύριον ἀποκάθαρσις εἶναι ἁμαρτιῶν μετὰ δόξης.

visited and carefully attended in their prisons;[34] and if they sanctioned the readmission of those who had fallen from the faith (lapsi) by their example, the church no longer ventured to refuse it.[35] In imitation of the family custom of annually commemorating at the grave the death of deceased members,[36] the churches celebrated the death of their martyrs[37] by prayer at their graves,[38] and by love-feasts.

---

34 *Tertull. ad martyres*, c. 1 *init.*: Inter carnis alimenta, benedicti martyres designati, quæ vobis et domina mater ecclesia de uberibus suis, et singuli fratres de opibus suis propriis in carcerem subministrant, capite aliquid et a nobis, quod faciat ad spiritum quoque educandum. Carnem enim saginari et spiritum esurire non prodest. The excess of this care (cf. *Lucian. de morte Peregrini*, c. 12) here only referred to, he bitterly rebukes, afterwards, in the Psychics *De jejunio*, c. 12: Plane vestrum est in carceribus popinas exhibere martyribus incertis, ne consuetudinem quærant, ne tædeat vitæ, ne nova abstinentiæ disciplina scandalizentur. He even accuses them of seeking to animate the prisoners for their trial, condito mero tanquam antidoto.

35 *Epist. Eccl. Vienn. et Lugd.* ap. *Euseb.* V. 2, § 3. *Tertull. ad Mart.* c. 1. Quam pacem quidam in ecclesia non habentes a martyribus in carcere exorare consueverunt. *Idem de pudicitia*, c. 22: Ut quisque ex consensione vincula induit adhuc mollia in novo custodiæ nomine, statim ambiunt mœchi, statim adeunt fornicatores, jam preces circumsonant, jam lacrymæ circumstagnant maculati cujusque, nec ulli magis aditum carceris redimunt, quam qui Ecclesiam perdiderunt.

36 *Tertull. de exhort. cast.* c. 11, to one who had married a second time: Neque enim pristinam poteris odisse, cui etiam religiosiorem reservas affectionem, ut jam receptæ apud Deum, pro cujus spiritu postulas, pro qua oblationes annuas reddis. Stabis ergo ad Deum cum tot uxoribus, quot in oratione commemoras, et offeres pro duabus, et commendabis illas duas. *De monogamia*, c. 10: Enimvero et pro anima ejus (mariti mortui) orat (uxor), et refrigerium interim adpostulat ei, et in prima resurrectione consortium, et offert annuis diebus dormitionis ejus.

37 *Epist. Eccl. Smyrn. de martyr. Polyc.* ap. *Euseb.* IV. 15, 15: Χριστὸν μὲν γὰρ υἱὸν ὄντα τοῦ Θεοῦ προσκυνοῦμεν· τοὺς δὲ μάρτυρας ὡς μαθητὰς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ μιμητὰς ἀγαπῶμεν ἀξίως, ἕνεκα εὐνοίας ἀνυπερβλήτου τῆς εἰς τὸν ἴδιον βασιλέα καὶ διδάσκαλον, ὧν γένοιτο καὶ ἡμᾶς συγκοινωνούς τε καὶ συμμαθητὰς γενέσθαι. — — οὕτως τε ἡμεῖς ὕστερον ἀνελόμενοι τὰ τιμιώτερα λίθων πολυτελῶν καὶ δοκιμώτερα ὑπὲρ χρυσίον ὀστᾶ αὐτοῦ (Πολυκάρπου), ἀπιθέμεθα ὅπου καὶ ἀκόλουθον ἦν. ἔνθα ὡς δυνατὸν ἡμῖν συναγομένοις ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει καὶ χαρᾷ, παρέξει ὁ κύριος ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου αὐτοῦ ἡμέραν γενέθλιον, εἴς τε τῶν προηθλησάντων μνήμην, καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἄσκησίν τε καὶ ἑτοιμασίαν. *Tert. de corona mil.* 3: Oblationes pro defunctis, *pro natalitiis* annua die facimus. *Cyprian. epist.* 34: Sacrificia pro eis (martyribus) semper, ut meministis, offerimus, quoties martyrum passiones et dies anniversaria commemoratione celebramus. Comp. *Cyprian's* instructions to his clergy, in what manner they were to provide for the honor of the Confessors, *Epist.* 37: Officium meum vestra diligentia repræsentet; faciat omnia quæ fieri oportet circa eos, quos in talibus meritis fidei ac virtutis illustravit divina dignatio. — Denique et dies eorum quibus excedunt annotate, ut commemorationes eorum inter memorias Martyrum celebrare possimus; — et celebrentur hic a nobis oblationes et sacrificia ob commemorationes eorum, quæ cito vobiscum Domino protegente celebrabimus. Any further notices of the martyrs were for the most part only the work of individuals: the statement of *Anastasius* (liber Pontificalis in vita *Clementis*): Hic fecit VII. regiones dividi Notariis fidelibus Ecclesiæ, qui gesta Martyrum sollicite et curiose, unusquisque per regionem suam, perquirerent (cf. vitæ *Anteri* and *Fabiani*), was an invention of later times. How little probability there is of our having genuine histories of the martyrs in this age is evident from *Augustini sermo XCIII. de diversis:* Hoc primum primi Martyris (Stephani) meritum

By this high estimation of the martyrs, Christians were sometimes led to deliver themselves up to the public authorities; thus justifying the charge of fanaticism brought against them by the Heathen.[39] For the most part, however, this practice was discountenanced, the words of Christ himself being brought against it (Matth. x. 23).[40]

---

commendatum est charitati vestræ: quia, cum aliorum Martyrum vix gesta inveniamus, quæ in solemnitatibus eorum recitare possimus, hujus passio in canonico libro est. *Gregorius M. lib. VIII. ep.* 29 *ad Eulogium Episc. Alex.*: Præter illa, quæ in Eusebii libris de gestis SS. Martyrum continentur, nulla in archivo hujus nostræ Ecclesiæ, vel in Romanæ urbis bibliothecis esse cognovi, nisi pauca quædam in unius codicis volumine collecta. Nos autem pene omnium martyrum, distinctis per dies singulos passionibus, collecta in uno codice nomina habemus, atque quotidianis diebus in eorum veneratione missarum solemnia agimus. Non tamen in eodem volumine, quis qualiter sit passus indicatur, sed tantummodo nomen, locus, et dies passionis ponitur. It is very doubtful whether the true reason of this is the one given by *Prudentius περὶ στεφάνων*, I. v. 75.

Chartulas blasphemus olium nam satelles abstulit,
Ne tenacibus libellis erudita sæcula
Ordinem, tempus, modumque passionis proditum,
Dulcibus linguis per aures posterorum spargerent.

cf. *Casp. Sagittarius* de natalitiis martyrum in primitiva ecclesia. Jen. 1678. auctius ed. *J. A. Schmid.* 1696. 4to.

38 Hence the cry of the Heathen: Areæ non sint, vid. *Tertull. ad Scapul.* c. 3.

39 *Tertull. ad Scapulam*, c. 5. Arrius Antoninus (in the time of Hadrian) in Asia cum persequeretur instanter, omnes illius civitatis Christiani ante tribunalia ejus se manu facta obtulerunt, cum ille paucis duci jussis, reliquis ait: *ὦ δειλοί, εἰ θέλετε ἀποθνήσκειν, κρημνοῖς ἢ βρόχοις ἔχετε.* Afterwards the Montanists especially, see Tertullian l. c. de fuga in persecutione etc. cf. *S. F. Rivini* diss. de professoribus veteris Ecclesiæ martyribus. Lips. 1739. 4to.

40 Epist. Eccl. Smyrn. c. 4: *οὐκ ἐπαινοῦμεν τοὺς προσιόντας ἑαυτοῖς, ἐπειδὴ οὐχ οὕτως διδάσκει τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.* (Eusebius, in his admiration of martyrdom, has omitted this sentence.) Clemens Alex. Strom. IV. p. 597; VII. p. 871, ed. Potter.

THIRD DIVISION.

FROM SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS TO THE SOLE EMPIRE OF CONSTANTINE. A. D. 193—324.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 53.

OF PAGANISM.

Surrounded by dangers on every side, (the Roman empire tottering to its fall, the throne publicly sold by a licentious soldiery, the provinces wasted by barbarians, and the government changed into the most arbitrary despotism,) men were glad to find a fancied refuge in the arms of superstition. The emperors themselves were not only the slaves of superstition, but openly confessed it, introducing various foreign rites into the city.[1] The philosophy of superstition, also, was now perfected in the New Platonic school,[2] the aim of which was to give to the prevailing tendency of the time a systematic basis, and defend it against the attacks of Christianity. The founder of this sect, *Ammonius Saccas* (Σακκᾶς, i. e. σακκοφόρος, *clad in sackcloth*) of Alexandria (+ about A. D. 243), had deserted Christianity for Paganism,[3] and seems to have modeled his philosophy after the doctrines of the Christian Gnostics. He communicated his system only under the pledge of secrecy. But by his disciple *Plotinus*, an Egyptian, (+ A. D. 270,) it was not only developed more fully, but spread abroad with incredible rapidity. He was followed with like success

---

1 *P. F. Müller* de hierarchia et studio vitæ asceticæ in sacris et mysteriis Græc. et Rom. latentibus. Hafn. 1803, in the third section. (German in the N. Bibl. d. schön. Wissensch. Bd. 70. S. 3 ff.)

2 Concerning this, comp. Tiedemanns Geist der specul. Philosoph. Th. 3. S. 262 ff. Tennemanns Gesch. der Philos. Bd. 6. [Manual of the Hist. of Phil. Translated by the Rev. Arthur Johnson, M. A. 8vo. Lond. 1832. — Tr.] C. Meiners Beitrag zur Geschichte der Denkart der ersten Jahrh. n. Chr. G. Leipzig. 1782. 8vo. S. 47 ff. *Imm. Fichte* de philosophiæ Novæ Platonicæ origine. Berol. 1818. *F. Bouterwek* Philosophorum Alexandrinorum ac Neo-Platonicorum recensio accuratior, in his *Commentationes Soc. Reg. Scient. Gotting. recentiores vol. V.* (1823) *Commentatt. hist. et philol.* p. 227 seq.

3 *Porphyrius contra Christianos* ap. *Euseb.* VI. 19: Ἀμμώνιος μὲν γὰρ Χριστιανὸς ἐν Χριστιανοῖς ἀνατραφεὶς τοῖς γονεῦσιν, ὅτε τοῦ φρονεῖν καὶ τῆς φιλοσοφίας ἥψατο, εὐθὺς πρὸς τὴν κατὰ νόμους πολιτείαν μετεβάλετο. On the other hand, Eusebius: τῷ Ἀμμωνίῳ τὰ τῆς ἐνθέου φιλοσοφίας ἀκέραια καὶ ἀδιάπτωτα καὶ μέχρις ἰσχάτης τοῦ βίου διέμενε τελευτῆς. Eusebius evidently refers here to another Ammonius, probably the author of the Harmony of the Gospel. (Hieron. in Catal. c. 55.)

by *Porphyry* of Tyre (+A. D. 304), and he by *Jamblichus* of Chalcis (+A. D. 333), who lived to see the final downfall of Paganism.[4]

These philosophers, like the Christian Gnostics, supposed all essential truth to be derived, not from a process of thought, but from direct inward perception. The principal points of their system were these: From the highest existence (τὸ ἕν) sprung Intelligence (ὁ νοῦς), and from this the Soul (ἡ ψυχή). The highest world, the world of Intelligence (κόσμος νοητός), is the sum (*Inbegriff*) of all intelligences, both divine and human, the visible world having been created by the Demiurgus. The Gods are distinguished into those dwelling above the world, ἄϋλοι, νοητοί, ἀφανεῖς), and those dwelling in the world (περικόσμιοι, αἰσθητοί, ἐμφανεῖς). To these last the different parts of the earth are intrusted, and from them its various nations have their peculiar character. Lower than the Gods are another class of spirits, the "Demons," some good and others bad. The common people are capable of worshipping the Supreme God only in their national deities, and to them it must be allowed; but the philosopher must strive after an immediate communion with the Infinite One. Such an elevation is to be attained by an ascetic life, and by Theurgy.*

CHAPTER FIRST.

EXTERNAL HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY.

§ 54.

DISPOSITION OF THE HEATHEN TOWARDS IT.

Of the doctrines of this New Platonic philosophy, none probably were more rapidly circulated than those concerning Christianity, the influence of which was still more to embitter and extend[1] the excite-

---

[4] Vita Plotini of Porphyrius in Fabric. Bibl. Gr. vol. IV. — *Eunapii* (A. D. 395) vitæ Sophistarum. rec. et illustr. *J. F. Boissonade.* Amst. 1822. 8vo. [Vid. Enfield Hist. of Phil. — Tr.]

* [Theurgy is the Science of the Gods, and of the various classes of Superior Spirits, of their appearing to men, and their operations; and the art, by certain acts, habits, words, and symbols, of moving the Gods to impart to men secrets, which surpass the powers of reason, to lay open the future to them, and become visible to them. So it is described in the book of Jamblichus, de Mysteriis Ægyptiorum. Lib. I. c. 26–29. Stäudlins Geschichte der Moralphilosophie, p. 462. From Murdock's Mosheim, Vol. I. p. 139. n. 19. — Tr.]

[1] *J. L. Mosheim* de turbata per recentiores Platonicos ecclesia (dissertt. ad hist. eccl. pert. vol. I.) p. 120–173. *Keil* de causis alieni Platonic. recent. a rel. Christ. animi (in opusc. acad. Sect. II. p. 393 seq.) Tschirners Fall des Heidenthums, I. S. 560.

ment already prevailing against it.[2] Most of these philosophers admitted, indeed, that Christ was a distinguished philosopher and theurgist. On the other hand, however, they maintained that his real doctrines corresponded entirely to theirs, and had been corrupted by his followers, especially by introducing the doctrine of his divinity, and forbidding the worship of the Gods.[3] Whilst they thus represented the Christians as a crowd of misguided fanatics, who had strayed from the principles of their master, they sought by mingling Paganism with their philosophy to infuse into it a higher and more spiritual character, so as if possible to counterbalance the moral superiority of Christianity. Thus was the new religion involved in a more earnest

---

2 Comp. § 38. The constant reproach of the Heathen was, (see *Cyprianus lib. ad Demetrianum*): Dixisti, per nos fieri, et quod nobis debeant imputari omnia ista, quibus nunc mundus quatitur et urgetur, quod dii vestri a nobis non colantur. *Arnobius adv. gentes*, I. c. 1: Postquam esse in mundo Christiana gens cœpit, terrarum orbem periisse, multiformibus malis affectum esse genus humanum: ipsos etiam Cœlites derelictis curis solennibus, quibus quondam solebant invisere res nostras, terrarum ab regionibus exterminatos. cf. *Maximini epist.* ap. *Euseb.* IX. 7, 4.

3 *Porphyrius* ap. Augustin. de Civ. Dei XIX. 23: Præter opinionem profecto quibusdam videatur esse quod dicturi sumus. Christum enim Dii piissimum pronunciaverunt et immortalem factum, et cum bona prædicatione ejus meminerunt (namely, through the oracles). Christianos autem pollutos et contaminatos et errore implicatos esse dicunt, et multis talibus adversus eos blasphemiis utuntur. — — De Christo autem interrogantibus si est Deus, ait Hecate: "Quoniam quidem immortalis anima post corpus ut incedit, nosti: a sapientia autem abscissa semper errat: viri pietate præstantissimi est illa anima, hanc colunt aliena a se veritate." (The same in *Euseb. demonstr. Evang.* III. c. 8.

> Ὅστι μὲν ἀθανάτη Ψυχὴ μετὰ σῶμα προβαίνει,
> Γιγνώσκει σοφίη τετιμημένος. ἀλλάγε ψυχὴ
> Ἀνέρος εὐσεβίη προφερεστάτη ἐστὶν ἐκείνου.)

— Sunt spiritus terreni minimi loco terreno quodam malorum Dæmonum potestati subjecti. Ab his sapientes Hebræorum, *quorum unus iste etiam Jesus fuit*, sicut audisti divina Apollinis oracula, quæ superius dicta sunt: ab his ergo Hebræi Dæmonibus pessimis et minoribus spiritibus vetabant religiosos, et ipsis vacare prohibebant: venerari autem magis cœlestes Deos, amplius autem venerari Deum patrem. Hoc autem et Dii præcipiunt, et in superioribus ostendimus, quemadmodum animadvertere ad Deum monent, et illum colere ubique imperant. Verum indocti et impiæ naturæ, quibus vere fatum non concessit a Diis dona obtinere, neque habere Jovis immortalis notionem, non audientes et Deos et divinos viros, Deos quidem omnes recusaverunt, prohibitos autem Dæmones non solum nullis odiis insequi, sed etiam revereri delegerunt. *Augustin. de consensu Evangelistar. lib.* I. c. 7, § 11: Honorandum enim tamquam sapientissimum virum putant, colendum autem tamquam Deum negant. *Ibid.* c. 9, § 14: Ita vero isti desipiunt, ut illis libris, quos eum (Christum) scripsisse existimant, dicant contineri eas artes, quibus eum putant illa fecisse miracula, quorum fama ubique percrebuit: quod existimando se ipsos produnt, quid diligant, et quid affectent. *Ibid.* c. 15: Vani Christi laudatores et Christianæ religionis obliqui obtrectatores — continent blasphemias a Christo, et eas in discipulos ejus effundunt. *Ibid.* c. 34: Ita enim volunt et ipsum credi, nescio quid aliud scripsisse, quod diligunt, nihilque sensisse contra Deos suos, sed eos potius magico ritu coluisse, et discipulos ejus non solum de illo fuisse mentitos, dicendo illum Deum, per quem facta sint omnia, cum aliud nihil quam homo fuerit, quamvis excellentissimæ sapientiæ: verum etiam de Diis eorum non hoc docuisse, quod ab illo didicissent.

strife than it had ever yet known, which continued till after the commencement of the 6th century. The beginning of this attack upon Christianity may perhaps be traced in the life of Apollonius of Tyana, written by Philostratus (A. D. 230), probably not without some aim of this sort (comp. § 14, note 7). The first direct attacks of professed disciples of this philosophy were that by *Porphyry*, κατὰ Χριστιανῶν λόγοι, in 15 books,[4] and that of *Hierocles*, governor of Bithynia under Diocletian, λόγοι φιλαλήθεις πρὸς Χριστιανούς, in two books.[5]

§ 55.

CONDUCT OF THE EMPERORS TOWARDS THE CHRISTIANS.

In the early part of this period (A. D. 193–324) Christianity was favorably regarded by several successive emperors, and admitted as one of the tolerated forms of worship. But towards its close there arose persecutions of a sterner character than had yet been known, being ordered by the imperial authority, and aiming at nothing less than the utter extirpation of the Christian religion.

Septimius Severus (A. D. 193–211) was not at first inimical to the Christians (Tertull. ad Scapulam, c. 4), though in the provinces they were exposed to the fury of the populace,[1] and the avarice of the governors.[2] But when the emperor, disgusted, perhaps, by the extravagances of the Montanists, had made it a crime to join their ranks (A. D. 203), these persecutions became much more violent.[3] Under

---

4 Whether he was a deserter from Christianity, as is asserted by Socrates, III. 23, Augustin. de civ. Dei X. 28, is doubtful; see the correspondence between *Siberus* and *Thomas* in Miscellan. Lips. T. I. p. 331 seq.—Fragments of his writings have been collected by *Luc. Holstenius* diss. de vita et scriptis Porphyrii. Rom. 1630. 8vo. (reprinted in *Fabricii* Bibl. gr. T. IV. p. 207 seq.) The replies of *Methodius*, bishop of Tyre, *Eusebius*, bishop of Cæsarea, and (the best) by *Apollinarius*, bishop of Laodicea, are also lost.

5 Cf. Lactant. institutt. div. V. c. 2 and 3. His comparison of Christ with Apollonius of Tyana answered by *Eusebius* contra Hierocl. lib. annexed to his Demonstr. Evangel. ed. Paris. 1628, and Colon. 1688.—Law of Valentinian III. and Theodosius II., that all writings against Christianity should be burnt. Cod. Justin. I. 1, 3, A. D. 449.

1 *Tertullian. de fuga in persecut.* c. 12: persecutionem — non esse — redimendam. — redemptio nummaria fuga est.

2 Tertull. Apologet. (written 198) c. 7, 12, 30, 37, 49. cf. *Mosheim* de ætate Apologet. Tertull. et initio persecut. Christ. sub Severo (dissertt. ad hist. eccl. pert. vol. I. p. 1 seq.)

3 cf. *Tertull.* de corona militis. — *Spartian.* in Severo, c. 17: In itinere Palestinis plurima jura fundavit. Judæos fieri sub gravi pœna vetuit. Idem etiam de Christianis sanxit. *Ulpianus* in lib. sing. de officio Præfecti Urbis (Dig. lib. I. tit. 12. § 14): *Divus Severus* rescripsit, eos etiam, qui illicitum collegium coisse dicuntur, apud Præfectum Urbis accusandos. Euseb. VI. 7: (Ἰούδας συγγραφέων ἕτερος) τὴν θρυλλουμένην τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου παρουσίαν ἤδη τότε πλησιάζειν ᾤετο· οὕτω σφοδρῶς ἡ τοῦ καθ' ἡμῶν τότε διωγμοῦ κίνησις, τὰς τῶν πολλῶν ἀνετάραττε διανοίας. Martyrs in Alexandria: *Leonides* (Euseb. VI. 1.), *Potamiæna* (ibid. c. 5); in Africa: *Martyres Scillitani*, *Perpetua et Felicitas* (Acta ap. Ruinart.) See Münter Primord. Eccl. Afric. p. 239.

Caracalla, however, (A. D. 211 - 217) they gradually ceased.[4] *Elagabalus* (A. D. 218 – 222) even proposed to amalgamate the Christian religion with the worship of his God.[5] In like manner, though less absurdly, *Alexander Severus* and his mother Julia (A. D. 222 – 235) united the worship of Christ with that of the Gods, and gave the Christians many proofs of good will.[6] *Maximin the Thracian*, (A. D. 235 – 238), though he confined his own enmity to the clergy, permitted a general persecution of the Christians in some of the provinces, where the populace had been excited against them by an earthquake.[7] During the reigns of *Gordian* (A. D. 238 – 244) and *Philip the Arabian* (A. D. 244 – 249)[8] they remained unmolested. But the accession of *Decius* (A. D. 249 – 251) was the signal for a fearful

---

4 Not in Africa at first, Tertull. ad Scapulam liber. — In this book, c. 4, Caracalla is called, lacte Christiano educatus. — Under this emperor, as appears from *Digest. Lib.* I. *Tit.* 16. *L.* 4, Domitius Ulpianus wrote his *Libb. X. de officio Proconsulis.* cf. *Lactant. institutt. V. c.* 11: Domitius de officio Proconsulis libro septimo rescripta principum nefaria collegit, ut doceret, quibus pœnis affici oporteret eos, qui se cultores Dei confiterentur.

5 *Lampridius* in Heliogabal. c. 3: Heliogabalum in Palatino monte juxta ædes imperatorias consecravit, eique templum fecit, studens et Matris typum et Vestæ ignem et Palladium et ancilia et omnia Romanis veneranda in illud transferre templum, et id agens, ne quis Romæ Deus, nisi Heliogabalus coleretur. Dicebat præterea, Judæorum et Samaritanorum religiones, et Christianum devotionem illuc transferendam, ut omnium culturarum secretum Heliogabali sacerdotium teneret.

6 Origen was summoned to Antioch by Julia Mamm., Euseb. VI. 21. Later writers (first Orosius VII. 18.) have hence been led to call her a Christian — *Lampridius in Alex. Sev.* c. 22: Judæis privilegia reservavit, Christianos esse passus est. c. 28: Quodam tempore festo, ut solent, Antiochenses, Ægyptii, Alexandrini lacessiverant eum conviciolis, *Syrum Archisynagogum* eum vocantes, et *Archierea.* c. 29: Matutinis horis in larario suo, in quo et divos Principes, sed optimos, electos, et animas sanctiores, in queis et Apollonium, et, quantum scriptor suorum temporum dicit, *Christum*, Abraham et Orpheum, et hujusmodi cæteros habebat, ac majorum effigies, rem divinam faciebat. c. 43: Christo templum facere voluit, eumque inter Deos recipere, quod et Hadrianus cogitasse fertur, — — : sed prohibitus est ab iis, qui consulentes sacra repererant omnes Christianos futuros, si id optato evenisset, et templa reliqua deserenda. (cf. *Heyne diss.* II.: *Alex. Severi imp. religiones miscellas probantis judicium illustratum et ad causas suas revocatum, in Opusc. acad.* vol. VI. p. 169.) c. 45: Ubi aliquos voluisset vel rectores provinciis dare, vel præpositos facere, vel procuratores, id est rationales ordinare, nomina eorum proponebat, hortans populum, ut si quis quid haberet criminis, probaret manifestis rebus: si non probasset, subiret pœnam capitis: grave esse, cum id Christiani et Judæi facerent in prædicandis sacerdotibus, qui ordinandi sunt, non fieri in provinciarum rectoribus, quibus et fortunæ hominum committerentur et capita. c. 49: Cum Christiani quendam locum, qui publicus fuerat, occupassent, contra popinarii dicerent, sibi eum deberi, rescripsit, *melius esse, ut quomodocunque illic Deus colatur, quam popinariis dedatur.*

7 Eusebius, VI. 28. *Firmilianus* ad Cyprian. (in epp. Cypr. 75.) *Origenes*, Commentar. in Matth. xxiv. 9. (Tom. 28.)

8 *Euseb. hist. eccl.* VI. 34: *τοῦτον κατέχει λόγος Χριστιανὸν ὄντα ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ὑστάτης τοῦ Πάσχα παννυχίδος τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας εὐχῶν τῷ πλήθει συμμεταστῆναι ἐθελῆσαι· οὐ πρότερον δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ τηνικάδε προεστῶτος* (according to Leontius, bishop of Antioch, about A. D. 350, in Chronic. Pasch. ad Olymp. 257, it was *Babylas*, bishop of Antioch) *ἐπιτραπῆναι εἰσβαλεῖν, ἢ ἐξομολογήσασθαι καὶ τοῖς ἐν παραπτώμασιν ἐξεταζομένοις, μετανοίας τε χώραν ἴσχουσιν, ἑαυτὸν καταλέξαι· — — καὶ πιθαρχῆσαί γε προθύμως λέγεται. Πιστον.* in Chron. ad. ann. 246: Philip-

(the first absolutely general) persecution,[9] in which many suffered martyrdom,[10] whilst many others, enervated by protracted prosperity, fell from their faith (sacrificati, thurificati, — libellatici.)[11] This persecution was kept up by *Gallus* (A. D. 251-253).[12] *Valerian* (A. D. 253-260) left the Christians unmolested for a time, but in the year 257 was persuaded by his favorite Macrianus to renew the persecution,[13]

---

pus primus omnium ex Romanis imperatoribus Christianus fuit. First contradicted by *Jos. Scaliger* ad Euseb. Chron. and *Is. Cosaubonus* ad. Jul. Capitolin. p. 201, particularly by *Frid. Spanheim* de Christianismo Phil. Ar. (opp. T. II. p. 400 seq.)

9 Of the earlier persecutions, *Origenes contra Celsum* III. p. 116: ὀλίγοι κατὰ καιροὺς καὶ σφόδρα ἐυαρίθμητοι περὶ τῆς Χριστιανῶν θεοσεβείας τεθνήκασι.

10 *Gregor. Nyssenus* in vita Gregor. Thaumaturgi (opp. T. III. p. 567): Πέμπει πρὸς τοὺς τῶν ἐθνῶν καθηγουμένους πρόσταγμα, φοβερὰν κατ' αὐτῶν τὴν ἀπειλὴν τῆς τιμωρίας ὁρίζων, εἰ μὴ παντοίοις αἰκισμοῖς τοὺς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Χριστοῦ προσκυνοῦντας διαλωβήσοιντο, καὶ προσαγάγοιεν πάλιν αὐτοὺς φόβῳ τε καὶ τῇ τῶν αἰκισμῶν ἀνάγκῃ τῇ πατρῴᾳ τῶν δαιμόνων λατρείᾳ. Descriptions by contempararies, *Dionys. Alex.* (in Euseb. VI. 40-42), *Cyprian* in his letters and de lapsis lib. — Martyrs: *Fabianus*, bishop of Rome, *Babylas* of Antioch, *Alexander* of Jerusalem, *Pionius*, Presbyter at Smyrna (*Cyprian.* epist. 52: tyrannus infestus sacerdotibus Dei.) — Legend de septem dormientibus apud urbem Ephesum first related by Gregor. Turon. de gloria martyr. I. 95. Extract from the Greek acts, Photius cod. 253. Afterwards transferred to Gaul (*Pseudo-*) *Gregor. Tur.* epist. ad Sulpic. Bituric., and to the north, *Paulus Diac.* de gestis Longob. I. 4to. Similar narration Plinii hist. nat. VII. 52.

11 Pretext of the *libellatici*, *Cypriani Epist.* 52: Ego prius legeram et Episcopo tractante cognoveram, non sacrificandum idolis: — et iccirco ne hoc facerem, quod non licebat, cum occasio libelli fuisset oblata, quem nec ipsum acciperem, nisi ostensa fuisset occasio, ad Magistratum vel veni, vel alio eunte mandavi: Christianum me esse, sacrificare mihi non licere, ad aras diaboli me venire non posse: dare me ob hoc præmium, ne quod non licet faciam. Different classes of them, *Cypr. Epist.* 31: Sententiam nostram — protulimus adversus eos, qui se ipsos infideles illicita nefariorum libellorum professione prodiderant, — quo non minus, quam si ad nefarias aras accessissent, hoc ipso quod ipsum contestati fuerant tenerentur; sed etiam adversus illos qui acta fecissent, licet præsentes cum fierent non affuissent, cum præsentiam suam utique, ut sic scriberentur mandando, fecissent. *Id. lib. de lapsis:* Nec sibi quominus agant pœnitentiam blandiantur, qui etsi nefandis sacrificiis manus non contaminaverunt, libellis tamen conscientiam polluerunt. Et illa professio denegantis contestatio est christiani: [*add.* est Christiani,] quod fuerat abnuentis. Fecisse se dixit quidquid alius faciendo commisit. cf. *Mosheim de rebus Christ. ante Const. M.* p. 483 seq. ["The Libellatici, or Certificated, are supposed to be such as purchased *certificates* from the corrupt magistrates, in which it was declared that they were Pagans, and had complied with the demands of the law, when neither of these was the fact. To purchase such a certificate was not only to be partaker in a fraudulent transaction, but it was to prevaricate before the public in regard to Christianity, and was inconsistent with that open confession of Christ before men, which he himself requires." Dr. Murdock's notes to Mosheim, vol. 1. p. 192. — Tr.]

12 *Dionys. Alex.* ap. Euseb. VII. 1. — *Cypriani* epist. 57, 58, et lib. ad *Demetrianum.*

13 *Dionys. Alex.* ap. Euseb. VII. 10, 11. *Cypriani* epist. 82, according to the report of the messengers he had sent to Rome: Quæ sunt in vero ita se habent. Rescripsisse Valerianum ad Senatum, ut Episcopi et Presbyteri et Diacones in continenti animadvertantur, Senatores vero et egregii viri et equites Romani, dignitate amissa, etiam bonis spolientur, et si ademptis facultatibus Christiani esse perseveraverint, capite quoque multentur; matronæ vero ademptis bonis in exsilium relegentur, Cæsariani autem, quicunque vel prius confessi fuerant, vel

which was continued till under *Gallienus* (A. D. 260 – 268).[14] His successors were too much occupied with their rivals, with barbarians and rebellions, to think of persecuting the Christians. *Aurelian*, however, (A. D. 270 – 275) issued an edict against them, but was murdered before it had ever been acted upon. Under *Diocletian* (A. D. 284 – 305) and his three associates in empire (*Maximian*, Augustus of the West, A. D. 285, *Galerius* and *Constantius Chlorus*, Cæsars, A. D. 292), the church was at first unmolested, notwithstanding the enmity of *Galerius*. The Christians were appointed to the most important offices, and all was peace and prosperity (Euseb. 8, 1). The supposed persecution by Maximian in Gaul and Rome[15] is very improbable. But in February, 303, Diocletian, yielding to his own superstition, and the persuasions of Galerius and Hierocles, ordered the magnificent church in Nicomedia to be destroyed, and then issued three successive edicts against the Christians,[16] which were

---

nunc confessi fuerint, confiscentur, et vincti in Cæsarianas possessiones descripti mittantur. Martyrs: *Cyprian* (vita et passio Cypr. scripta per Pontium diaconum ejus — Acta proconsularia ejusd. in Ruinart), *Sixtus II.*, bishop of Rome, and *Laurentius*, his deacon. (Prudentius περὶ στεφάνων, Hymn. 2).

14 His were the earliest decrees of toleration. Two rescripts addressed to Christian bishops are cited by Eusebius, VII. 13. The first is that in which Gallienus, after having conquered Egypt (A. D. 261), proclaims to the Christian bishops in that country the toleration already extended to the rest of the realm: *τὴν εὐεργεσίαν τῆς ἐμῆς δωρεᾶς διὰ παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου ἐκβιβασθῆναι προσέταξα. ὅπως ἀπὸ τῶν τόπων τῶν θρησκευσίμων ἀποχωρήσωσι. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὑμεῖς τῆς ἀντιγραφῆς τῆς ἐμῆς τῷ τύπῳ χρῆσθαι δύνασθε, ὥστε μηδένα ὑμῖν ἐνοχλεῖν.* The other, *τὰ τῶν καλουμένων κοιμητηρίων ἀπολαμβάνειν ἐπιτρέπων χωρία.*

15 Legio Thebæa, leg. felix Agaunensis. Thebans with their leader (primicerius) Mauricius (286?) massacred in Acaunensibus angustiis (Agaunum, St. Maurice in Wallis). *Eusebius*, *Lactantius*, *Prudentius*, *Sulpitius Severus*, are silent. The first mention of such an event about A. D. 520 in *vita S. Romani* (Acta SS. Februar. T. III. p. 740). Then by *Avitus*, archbishop of Vienne († 523), dicta in Basilica SS. Agaunensium in innovatione monasterii ipsius vel passione martyrum. By *Eucherius*, bishop of Lyons (about A. D. 530), Passio SS. Mauricii ac sociorum ejus (in Ruinart.) — This Latin tradition Simeon Metaphrasta (Acta SS. Februar. T. III. p. 237) seems to have transferred arbitrarily to a Greek martyr *Mauricius* (*Theodoret.* Græc. affect. curat. disput. VIII. in fine), a tribunus milit. who with 70 soldiers is supposed to have been executed in Apamea, in Syria, by command of Maximin. Against this tradition, see *Jean Dubordieu* diss. hist. et crit. sur le martyre de la Légion Thebéenne, Amst. 1705. 12mo. For it *Jos. de L'Isle* defense de la vérité de la Légion Thebéenne. Nancy. 1737. 12mo. — Later additions of Thebans, who are said to have suffered in other places, e. g. *Gregor. Turon.* de gloria martyr. I. 62: Est apud Agrippinensem urbem basilica, in qua dicuntur L viri ex illa legione sacra Thebæorum, pro Christi nomine martyrium consummasse. *Ado* (about A. D. 860) has Gereon et alii CCCXVIII. — The whole scene has since been transferred to the neighbourhood of Pavia (Act. SS. Sept. T. VI. p. 377, 908 seq.). It is possible that these legends have sprung from a misunderstanding of the expression *milites Christi.*

16 Concerning all these persecutions see the contemporaries, *Lactantius* de mortibus persecutorum, c. 7 seq. and *Eusebius* hist. eccl. libb. VIII — X. First Edict, Euseb. VIII. 2: *τὰς μὲν ἐκκλησίας εἰς ἔδαφος φέρειν, τὰς δὲ γραφὰς ἀφανεῖς συρὶ γενέσθαι· καὶ τοὺς μὲν τιμῆς ἐπειλημμένους, ἀτίμους· τοὺς δὲ ἐν οἰκετείαις, εἰ ἐπιμένοιεν ἐν τῇ τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ προθέσει, ἐλευθερίας στερεῖσθαι.* (*Rufin.* ne, si quis servorum permansisset Christianus, libertatem consequi posset.) *Lactant. de mort. Persec.* c. 13: Postridie propositum est edictum, quo cavebatur, ut

finally followed by a fourth in the year 304, by which all Christians without exception were forced to worship the images of the Gods[17] Thus arose a most bitter persecution (in which many saved themselves by surrendering the sacred books to the magistrates, — hence called *traditores*), in every part of the empire excepting in Gaul, where Constantius Chlorus was already favorably disposed towards the Christians.[18] After the two Augusti had resigned their imperial honors (A. D. 305) the persecution still raged in the East, under the new Augustus, Galerius, and his Cæsar, Maximin;[19] though it ceased entirely in Gaul and Spain, where the Augustus, Constantius Chlorus, commanded, and was at least much moderated in Italy and Africa under the Cæsar, Julius Severus. After the death of Constantius Chlorus (A. D. 306), his son *Constantine* granted the Christians in Gaul and Spain full liberty of worship, and even in Italy, under Maxentius and Maximian, the persecution was stopped.[20] In the East, the Christians were protected for a time by an edict issued by Galerius, in the year 311;[21] but, six months after, the persecution was

---

religionis illius homines carerent omni honore ac dignitate, tormentis subjecti essent, ex quocunque ordine ac gradu venirent, adversus eos omnis actio valeret; ipsi non de injuria, non de adulterio, non de rebus ablatis agere possent; libertatem denique ac vocem non haberent. Illustrations of this Edict in *Mosheim* de rebus Christ. ante Const. M. p. 925 seq. — Second Edict. *Euseb.* VIII. 6, 8. (cf. VIII. 2, 3): τοὺς πανταχόσε τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν προεστῶτας εἱρκταῖς καὶ δεσμοῖς ἐνεῖσαι. Third Edict, Euseb. VIII. 6, 10: τοὺς κατακλείστους, θύσαντας μὲν, ἐὰν βαδίζειν ἐπ' ἐλευθερίας, ἐνισταμένους δὲ μυρίαις καταξαίνειν βασάνοις. (Cf. *Euseb.* VIII. 2, 3: πάσῃ μηχανῇ θύειν ἐξαναγκάζειν.)

17 Fourth Edict, Eusebius de martyribus Palæstinæ, c. 3: καθολικῷ προσστάγματι πάντας πανδημεὶ τοὺς κατὰ πόλιν θύειν τε καὶ σπένδειν τοῖς εἰδώλοις ἐκελεύετο, κ. τ. λ.

18 *Lactant. de mort. persec.* c. 15: Constantius, ne dissentire a majorum præceptis videretur, conventicula, id est parietes, qui restitui poterant, dirui passus est, verum autem Dei templum, quod est in hominibus, incolume servavit. c. 16: Vexabatur ergo universa terra, et præter Gallias ab oriente usque ad occasum tres acerbissimæ bestiæ sæviebant. The Donatist bishops wrote therefore, A. D. 313, to Constantine (*Optat. Milevit.* I. c. 22): Pater inter cæteros imperatores persecutionem non exercuit, et ab hoc facinore immunis est Gallia.

19 Martyrs in Palestine, Eusebius de mart. Palæst. liber (*Pamphilus* Presb. in Cæsarea): in other countries, Euseb. h. e. VIII. 7–13. (*Petrus*, bishop of Alexandria, *Lucianus*, presb. in Antioch), comp. *Ruinart.*

20 *Lactant. de mort. persecut.* c. 24. Suscepto imperio Constantinus Augustus nihil egit prius, quam Christianos cultui ac Deo suo reddere. Hæc fuit prima ejus sanctio sanctæ religionis restitutæ. Euseb. VIII. 14: Μαξέντιος — — ἀρχόμενος μὲν τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς πίστιν ἐπ' ἀρετσκείᾳ καὶ κολακείᾳ τοῦ δήμου Ῥωμαίων καθυπεκρίνατο· ταύτῃ τε τοῖς ὑπηκόοις τὸν κατὰ Χριστιανῶν ἀνεῖναι προσστάττει διωγμόν.

21 *Lactant. de mort. persecut.* c. 34. *Euseb.* VIII. 17: *Imp. Cæsar Galerius Valerius Maximianus* cæt., et *Imp. Cæsar Flavius Valerius Constantinus* cæt., et *Imp. Cæsar Valerius Licinius* cæt. Provincialibus S. — Inter cætera, quæ pro reipublicæ semper commodis atque utilitate disponimus, nos quidem volueramus antehac juxta leges veteres et publicam disciplinam Romanorum cuncta corrigere, atque id providere, ut etiam Christiani, qui parentum suorum reliquerant sectam, ad bonas mentes redirent. Siquidem quadam ratione tanta eosdem Christianos voluntas invasisset, et tanta stultitia occupasset, ut non illa veterum instituta sequerentur, quæ forsitan primum parentes eorundem constituerant (cf. § 54, particularly note 3): sed pro arbitrio suo, atque ut hisdem erat libitum, ita

renewed in the Asiatic provinces by Maximin.[22] Constantine, having become master of the whole Western empire by his victory over Maxentius (A. D. 312), issued an edict of universal toleration in conjunction with *Licinius*, who now ruled all the European provinces of the East. This was soon followed by a special edict in favor of the Christians,[23] issued from Milan, A. D. 313. After the defeat of Maximin this edict became valid throughout the Roman empire.

sibimet leges facerent, quas observarent, et per diversa varios populos congregarent. Denique cum ejusmodi nostra jussio extitisset, ut ad veterum se instituta conferrent, multi periculo subjugati, multi etiam deturbati sunt. Atque cum plurimi in proposito perseverarent, ac videremus, nec Diis eosdem cultum ac religionem debitam exhibere, nec Christianorum Deum observare; contemplationem mitissimæ nostræ clementiæ intuentes et consuetudinem sempiternam, qua solemus cunctis hominibus veniam indulgere, promtissimam in his quoque indulgentiam nostram credidimus porrigendam, ut denuo sint Christiani, et conventicula sua componant, ita ut ne quid contra disciplinam agant. Alia autem epistola judicibus significaturi sumus, quid debeant observare. Unde juxta hanc indulgentiam nostram debebunt Deum suum orare pro salute nostra, et reipublicæ, ac sua, ut undiqueversum respublica perstet incolumis, et securi vivere in sedibus suis possint.

22 See the description, *Euseb.* IX. 1–8.

23 *Euseb.* X. 5. *Lactant. de morte persec.* c. 48: Ἤδη μὲν πάλαι σκοποῦντες τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς θρησκείας οὐκ ἀρνητέαν εἶναι, ἀλλ' ἑνὸς ἑκάστου τῇ διανοίᾳ καὶ βουλήσει ἐξουσίαν δοτέον τοῦ τὰ θεῖα πράγματα τιμελεῖν κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ προαίρεσιν, ἕκαστον κεκελεύκειμεν, τούς τε Χριστιανοὺς, τῆς αἱρέσεως καὶ τῆς θρησκείας τῆς ἑαυτῶν τὴν πίστιν φυλάττειν. Ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ πολλαὶ καὶ διάφοροι αἱρέσεις (i. e. conditiones, see *Martini's* not. y. citirte Schrift. S. 13, not. 24) ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἀντιγραφῇ, ἐν ᾗ τοῖς αὐτοῖς συνεχωρήθη ἡ τοιαύτη ἐξουσία, ἐδόκουν προστεθεῖσθαι σαφῶς, τυχὸν ἴσως τινὲς αὐτῶν μετ' ὀλίγον ἀπὸ τῆς τοιαύτης παραφυλάξεως ἀνεκρούοντο. (Quamobrem) cum feliciter tam ego *Constantinus Aug.*, quam etiam ego *Licinius Aug.* apud Mediolanum convenissemus, atque universa, quæ ad commoda et securitatem publicam pertinerent, in tractatu haberemus; hæc inter cætera, quæ videbamus pluribus hominibus profutura, vel inprimis ordinanda esse credidimus, quibus divinitatis reverentia continebatur: ut daremus et Christianis et omnibus liberam potestatem sequendi religionem, quam quisque voluisset, quo quidem divinitas in sede cœlesti nobis atque omnibus, qui sub potestate nostra sunt constituti, placata ac propitia possit existere. Itaque hoc consilio salubri ac rectissima ratione ineundum esse credidimus, ut nulli omnino facultatem abnegandam putaremus, qui vel observationi Christianorum, vel ei religioni mentem suam dederet, quam ipse sibi aptissimam esse sentiret, ut possit nobis summa divinitas, cujus religioni liberis mentibus obsequimur, in omnibus solitum favorem suum benevolentiamque præstare. Quare scire dignationem tuam convenit, placuisse nobis, ut amotis omnibus omnino conditionibus, quæ prius scriptis ad officium tuum datis super Christianorum nomine videbantur, nunc caveres, ut simpliciter unusquisque eorum, qui eandem observandæ religionis Christianorum gerunt voluntatem, citra ullam inquietudinem ac molestiam sui id ipsum observare contendant. Quæ sollicitudini tuæ plenissime significanda esse credidimus, quo scires, nos liberam atque absolutam colendæ religionis suæ facultatem hisdem Christianis dedisse. Quod cum hisdem a nobis indultum esse pervideas, intelligit dignatio tua, etiam aliis religionis suæ vel observantiæ potestatem similiter apertam et liberam pro quiete temporis nostri esse concessam, ut in colendo, quod quisque delegerit, habeat liberam facultatem, [quia videri nolumus aut cuiquam] honori aut cuiquam religioni aliquid a nobis [detractum]. Atque hoc insuper in persona Christianorum statuendum esse censuimus; quod si eadem loca, ad quæ antea convenire consueverant, de quibus etiam datis ad officium tuum literis certa antehac forma fuerat comprehensa, priore tempore aliqui vel a fisco nostro vel ab alio quocunque videntur esse mercati, eadem Christianis sine pecunia et sine ulla pretii petitione, postposita omni frustratione atque ambi-

Constantine[24] had inherited from his father a favorable disposition towards the Christians; and having afterwards been led (partly no doubt by the influence of his mother Helena) to ascribe his success in arms to their God,[25] it is possible, that he may very early have worshipped him in common with the Heathen Deities. But the marks of favor, which he now began to bestow on the Christians, are probably to be traced not so much to his actual regard for their religion, as to his political foresight, which readily perceived the advantage of attaching to his cause the more united and active, though less numerous

---

guitate, restituantur. Qui etiam dono fuerunt consecuti, eadem similiter hisdem Christianis quantocius reddant. Et vel hi, qui emerunt, vel qui dono fuerunt consecuti, si putaverint, de nostra benevolentia aliquid vicarium postulent, quo et ipsis per nostram clementiam consulatur. Quæ omnia corpori Christianorum protinus per intercessionem tuam ac sine mora tradi oportebit. Et quoniam iidem Christiani non ea loca tantum, ad quæ convenire consueverunt, sed alia etiam habuisse noscuntur, ad jus corporis eorum, id est ecclesiarum, non hominum singulorum, pertinentia: ea omnia lege, qua superius, comprehendimus, citra ullam prorsus ambiguitatem vel controversiam hisdem Christianis, id est corpori et conventiculis eorum, reddi jubebis; supra dicta scilicet ratione servata, ut ii, qui eadem sine pretio, sicut diximus, restituerint, indemnitatem de nostra benevolentia sperent. In quibus omnibus supra dicto corpori Christianorum intercessionem tuam efficacissimam exhibere debebis, ut præceptum nostrum quantocius compleatur; quo etiam in hoc per clementiam nostram quieti publicæ consulatur. Hactenus fiet, ut sicut superius comprehensum est, divinus juxta nos favor, quem in tantis sumus rebus experti, per omne tempus prospere successibus nostris cum beatitudine publica perseveret. Ut autem hujus sanctionis benevolentiæ nostræ forma ad omnium possit pervenire notitiam, prolata programmate tuo hæc scripta, et ubique proponere, et ad omnium scientiam te perferre conveniet, ut hujus benevolentiæ nostræ sanctio latere non possit.

[24] Concerning him, *Franc. Balduini* Canstantinus M. s. de Const. Imp. legibus eccl. et civ. libri II. Basil. 1556. Hal. 1727. 8vo. C. D. A. Martini Ueber die Einführung der christl. Rel. als Staats-relig. durch den Kaiser Const. München. 1813. 4to. — J. C. F. Manso Leben Constantins d. G. Breslau. 1817. 8vo. Hug in the Zeitschrift f. d. Geistl. d. Erzb. Freyburg. 1829. Heinichen Excurs. I. affixed to his ed. of Euseb. Vita Constantin. p. 507 seq.

[25] On his expedition against Maxentius *Lactant. de mort. persec.* c. 44: Commonitus est in quiete Constantinus, ut cœleste signum Dei notaret in scutis, atque ita prœlium committeret. Fecit, ut jussus est, et transversa X. littera, summo capite circumflexo, Christum in scutis notat. The Heathen *Nazarius* also flatters Constantine with the same story, Panegyric. c. 14: In ore denique est omnium Galliarum, exercitus visos, qui se divinitus missos præ se ferebant. — Hæc ipsorum sermocinatio, hoc inter audientes ferebant, *Constantinum petimus, Constantino imus auxilio.* It was not till his dotage that the pious Constantine related to Eusebius the story of the cross with the inscription, *hac vince, τούτῳ νίκᾳ*, Euseb. de vit. Const. I. 28 - 32. *Sozom.* I. 3, and *Rufin.* I. 9, suppose this to have been merely a dream, and the Heathen, of course, derided all these stories, vid. *Gelasius* Cyzic. hist. conc. Nicæni, I. 4. cf. *Mosheim* de rebus Christ. ante Const. M. p. 978 seq. Concerning the cipher of Christ's name, vid. Münters Sinnbilder der alten Christen, Heft. 1. S. 33 ff. The standard bearing this cipher was afterwards called Labarum, vid. *du Cange* diss. de numis. infer. ævi § 20. — These, and other similar legends of the same age, had their origin in the feeling that the final struggle was come between Paganism and Christianity. Thus it is related (*Lactant.* de mort. Persecut. c. 46), that before the battle with Maximin a prayer was taught to Licinius by an angel, which was to secure him the victory. Gregory Nazianen relates, that an army of demons accompanied Julian on his expedition into Persia; though according to Libanius it was an army of Gods. See *Ullman's* Gregorius v. Nazianz. S. 100. [Murdock's Mosheim, p. 261, note. — Tr.]

party. He released their clergy from the burdensome municipal offices (A. D. 312);[26] made valid the manumission of slaves in the churches (at some time previous to A. D. 316);[27] allowed legacies to be left them (321),[28] and himself contributed a considerable sum to the support of the African clergy.[29] His decreeing the observance of the Sunday (A. D. 321) does not necessarily prove him a Christian,[30] but he passed many other laws, in which the influence of Christian no-

---

26 The first law *ad Anulinum Procons.* Africæ in *Euseb.* h. e. X. c. 7, confirmed by a second, *Cod. Theod.* XVI. *Tit. II. L.* 1, A. D. 313, and repeated in a third, *l. c. L.* 2, A. D. 319. The last: Qui divino cultui ministeria impendunt, i. e. hi qui Clerici appellantur, ab omnibus omnino muneribus excusentur, ne sacrilego livore quorundam a divinis obsequiis avocentur. In this Constantine only transferred to the Christian clergy a right of the Heathen priests. cf. *Symmachus, lib. X. Ep.* 54: Insigne ducitur Sacerdotii vacare muneribus. *Cod. Theod. XII. Tit.* 1. *L.* 75, and *Gothofred.* ad h. l. The leaders of the Jewish synagogues had the same immunity. cf. *Cod. Theod.* XVI. *Tit.* VIII. *L.* 3, A. D. 321. *Decurionibus Agrippinensibus:* Cunctis Ordinibus generali lege concedimus, Judæos vocare ad Curiam. Verum, ut aliquid ipsis ad solatium pristinæ observationis relinquatur, binos vel ternos privilegio perpeti (i. e. *perpetuo*) patimur nullis nominationibus occupari. *Lex* 2, A. D. 330: Qui devotione tota Synagogis Judæorum, Patriarchiis vel Presbyteriis se dederunt, et in memorata secta degentes legi ipsi præsident, immunes ab omnibus tam personalibus quam civilibus muneribus perseverent. *Lex* 4, A. D. 331: Hiereos, et Archisynagogos, et Patres Synagogarum, et ceteros, qui Synagogis deserviunt, ab omni corporali munere liberos esse præcipimus.

27 According to *Sozomen*, he passed three laws on this subject; the first is lost: for the second, see *Cod. Justin.* 1. Tit. 13. L. 1. A. D. 316: the third, *ibid.* L. 2, and *Cod. Theod.* IV. Tit. 7. L. *unic.* A. D. 321. That this right of manumission was transferred from the Heathen Temples, is shown by Gothofredus, comm. to this last law.

28 *Cod. Theod.* XVI. *Tit.* 2. *L.* 4, and *Cod. Just.* I. *Tit.* 2. *L.* 1: Habeat unusquisque licentiam, sanctissimo catholico venerabilique concilio, decedens bonorum quod optaverit relinquere.

29 Namely, 3000 folles (more than $50,000). cf. *Const. epist. ad Cæcilianum Episc. Carthag.* in *Euseb.* h. e. X. c. 6.

30 The first law (March, 321) is in *Cod. Justin.* III. *Tit.* 12. *L.* 3: Omnes judices, urbanæque plebes, et cunctarum artium officia venerabili die Solis quiescant. Ruri tamen positi agrorum culturæ libere licenterque inserviant: quoniam frequenter evenit, ut non aptius alio die frumenta sulcis, aut vineæ scrobibus mandentur. (In Virgil. Georg. 1. v. 268 seq. Cato de re rust. c. 2. cf. *Erycius Puteanus de Nundinis Romanis*, c. 10, in Grævii thes. antiquitt. Rom. T. VIII. p. 658). The second (June of the same year), in *Cod. Theod.* II. *Tit.* 8. *L.* 1., with the addition, emancipandi et manumittendi die festo cuncti licentiam habeant, et super his rebus actus non prohibeantur. From the beginning of the third century, the Egyptian week, of which the seven days were consecrated to the planets, had become common amongst the Romans by means of the astrologers (Dio Cassius, XXXVII. c. 18). As Christ was often confounded with Sol or Apollo, Constantine may have hoped by the appointment of a dies Solis, in honor at once of Christ and the Sun, to unite both parties. He transferred the Nundines to Sunday: comp. the inscription *de Nundinis Romanis*, c. 26. Erycius Puteanus: Constantinus — provisione etiam pietatis suæ Nundinas die solis perpeti anno constitit. Still the Nundines and the weeks were both kept up, and both are found in an old calendar, written about the year 354 (Grævii Thes. T. VIII. p. 97); till Theodosius I. renewed the law concerning the observance of Sunday. *Cod. Theod.* VIII. *Tit.* 8. *L.* 3 — *Eusebius* de vit. Const. IV. 18, and *Sozomen*, I. 8, relate, that Constantine ordered the observance of Friday as well as Sunday.

tions is not to be mistaken.[31] Though Constantine allowed the Heathen unrestrained religious freedom, and even observed as emperor all their usages,[32] his partiality to the Christians was yet so evident, that when Licinius and he became estranged, the former was enabled by renewed attention to the rites of their religion, and by the persecution of Christianity, to enlist the Heathen, who were the most numerous party, in his cause.[33] Thus the contest between Constantine and Licinius (A. D. 323) may be looked upon as the final struggle of Paganism with Christianity. Licinius was defeated; and from this time Constantine openly professed himself a Christian,[34] though he put off for the present the rite of baptism.[35]

---

31 *Cod. Theod.* XVI. *Tit.* 8. *L.* 1. A. D. 315: Judæis, et Majoribus eorum, et Patriarchis volumus intimari, quod si qui, post hanc legem, aliquem, qui eorum feralem fugerit sectam, et ad Dei cultum respexerit, saxis aut alio furoris genere (quod nunc fieri cognoscimus) ausus fuerit adtemptare, mox flammis dedendus et cum omnibus suis participibus concremandus. Si quis vero ex populo ad eorum nefariam sectam accesserit, et conciliabulis eorum se adplicaverit, cum ipsis pœnas meritas sustinebit. — *Cod. Theod.* IX. *Tit.* 40. *L.* 2. A. D. 315: Si quis in ludum fuerit, vel in metallum damnatus, minime in ejus facie scribatur: — quo facies, quæ ad similitudinem pulchritudinis cœlestis est figurata, minime maculetur. — Probably in the same year, vetus veterrimumque supplicium patibulorum et cruribus suffringendis primus removit, (*Aurel. Victor de Cæsar. c.* 41. *Sozom.* I. 8). — *Cod. Theod.* VIII. *Tit.* 15. *L.* 1. A. D. 320: Qui jure veteri Cælibes habebantur: imminentibus Legum (namely, the *L. Julia* and *Papia Poppæa*) terroribus liberentur etc. (cf. *Euseb. de vit. Const.* IV. 26.)

32 Cod. Theod. IX. 16, 1, 2, XVI. 10, 1. Zosimus II. 29. ἐχρῆτο δὲ ἔτι καὶ τοῖς πατρίοις ἱεροῖς.

33 Euseb. h. e. X. 8, de vita Constant. II. 3 seq.

34 From A. D. 323, the Heathen symbols disappear from Constantine's coins. *J. Eckhel* doctrina numorum veterum, vol. VIII. (Vindob. 1798. 4to. p. 79.)

35 Modern Catholic writers do not admit what was taken for granted as late as Baronius and Schelstraten, that Constantine was baptized in Rome by Sylvester, A. D. 324 (breviar. Rom. 31. Decemb.) Comp. Euseb. de vita Const. IV. 61, 62. — The investitures connected with this tradition are mentioned first by Pope Hadrian I. A. D. 780. (See below, Vol. II. Div. I. § 5, note 12); the act of investiture is first found in Hincmar and Æneas Parisiensis, about A. D. 850. That neither of these authorities is genuine, was asserted as early as the year 999, by the emperor Otho III. (See Vol. II. Div. I. § 22, note 24), and acknowledged by the church of Rome in 1152 (Vol. II. Div. III. § 51, note 18). Since the spirited attack of Laurentius Valla (de falso credita et ementita donatione Const. M.), the act of investiture is universally allowed to be spurious, and the investiture itself mentioned only by a few of the older Catholic writers, especially the Jesuits Jac. Gretser and Nic. Schaten.

From the fourth century the number of the persecutions was fixed at ten; according to Exod. vii.–x., and Rev. xvii. 1–14. Different calculations: *Sulpic. Sever.* hist. sacr. II. 33: Sacris vocibus decem plagis mundum afficiendum pronunciatum est: ita quum jam novem fuerint, quæ superest, ultima erit. On the other hand, *Augustin.* de civ. Dei XVIII. 52: Nonnullis visum est, vel videtur, non amplius ecclesiam passuram persecutiones usque ad tempus Antichristi, quam quot jam passa est, id est decem, ut undecima novissima sit ab Antichristo. Augustine reckons thus (the variations in Sulpicius Severus are enclosed in parentheses): I. Neronis, II. Domitiani, III. Trajani, (IV. *Hadriani*): IV. (V.) Marci Aurelii, V. (VI.) Sept. Severi, VI. Maximini, VII. (VII.) Decii, VIII. (VIII.) Valeriani, IX. Aureliani, X. (IX.) Diocletiani. *Augustinus l. c.* adds: Sed ego illa re gesta in Ægypto istas persecutiones prophetice significatas esse

§ 56.

SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

In this division of our period also, the progress of Christianity was very considerable,[1] especially in Gaul.[2] Towards the end of it we find the first traces of bishops on the Rhine;[3] and nearly at the same time in Britain.[4] In Vindelicia also we now hear of Christianity;[5] and it had been carried even amongst the Goths by Christian captives.[6]

---

non arbitror, quamvis ab eis, qui hoc putant, exquisite et ingeniose illa singula his singulis comparata videantur: non prophetico spiritu, sed conjectura mentis humanæ, quæ aliquando ad verum pervenit, aliquando fallitur.

1 Concerning its state about A. D. 300, vid. *Arnobius*, I. c. 16: Si *Alamannos, Persas, Scythas* (Dii) iccirco voluerunt devinci, quod habitarent et degerent in eorum gentibus Christiani; quemadmodum *Romanis* tribuere victoriam, cum habitarent et degerent in eorum quoque gentibus Christiani? Si in *Asia, Syria*, iccirco mures et locustas effervescere prodigialiter voluerunt, quod ratione consimili habitarent in eorum gentibus Christiani: in *Hispania, Gallia*, cur eodem tempore horum nihil natum est, cum innumeri viverent in his quoque provinciis Christiani? Si apud *Getulos, Tinguitanos* hujus rei causa siccitatem satis ariditatemque miserunt, eo anno cur messes amplissimas *Mauris Nomadibusque* tribuerunt, cum religio similis his quoque in regionibus verteretur?

2 *Passio Saturnini Episc. Tolosani*, c. 2. in *Ruinart*: Postquam sensim et gradatim in omnem terram Evangeliorum sonus exivit, parique progressu in regionibus nostris Apostolorum prædicatio coruscavit: cum raræ in aliquibus civitatibus ecclesiæ paucorum Christianorum devotione consurgerent; — ante annos L. sicut actis publicis (*Codd. alii: ante annos satis plurimos*), i. e. *Decio et Grato Consulibus* (i. e. A. D. 250), *sicut fideli recordatione retinetur, primum et summum Christi Tolosa civitas s. Saturninum habere cœperat sacerdotem.* Hence *Gregorius Turonensis* (about 590) *hist. Franc.* I. c. 28: Decii tempore septem viri Episcopi ad prædicandum in Gallias missi sunt, sicut historia passionis s. martyris Saturnini denarrat. Ait enim: *Sub Decio et Grato Consulibus cæt.* as above. Hi ergo missi sunt: Turonicis Gatianus Episcopus, Arelatensibus Trophimus Episc., Narbonæ Paulus Episc., Tolosæ Saturninus Episc., Parisiacis Dionysius Episc., Avernis Stremonius Episc., Lemovicinis Martialis est destinatus Episcopus. This is evidently an arbitrary combination of various traditions. Trophimus must have been bishop of Arles at a much earlier period; for in 254, Marcian had long been bishop there. See *Cyprian. ep.* 67, Pearson ann. Cyp. ad ann. 254. *Zosimi P. Epist. I. ad Episcopos Galliæ*, A. D. 417 (*Coustant*): Metropolitanæ Arelatensium urbi vetus privilegium minime derogandum est, ad quam *primum* ex hac sede Trophimus summus Antistes, *ex cujus fonte totæ Galliæ fidei rivulos acceperunt*, directus est.

3 First in the list of the commissioners appointed by Constantine to decide the Donatist controversy in Rome, A. D. 313. *Optat. Milev. de schism. Donatist. I. c.* 23: Dati sunt judices Maternus ex Agrippina civitate: then amongst the names subscribed to the decrees of the *Concil. Arelatensis*, A. D. 314: Maternus Episcopus, Macrinus Diaconus de civitate Agrippinensium. — Agrœcius Episcopus, Felix exorcista de civitate Treverorum. *Nic. ab Hontheim* hist. diplom. Trevirana in prodromo, T. I. p. 64 seq. *Walch* de Materno uno in the *Commentationes Soc. Gotting. vol.* I. (1779) comm. hist. et philol. p. 1 seq.

4 Signers of the Concil. Arelat.: *Eborius* episcopus, de civitate Eboracensi, provincia Britannia. — *Restitutus* episcopus, de civitate Londinensi, provincia suprascripta. *Adelfius* episcopus, de civitate colonia Londinensium (perhaps Colonia Lindi i. e. *Lincoln*), comp. *Jac. Usserii* Britannicarum ecclesiar. antiquitt. Lond. 1687. Bingham origg. eccl. Tom. III. p. 557 seq.

5 *Afra* burnt in Augsburg, 304. Passio S. Afræ martyris, see *Ruinart*.

6 Sozomen, h. e. II. 6. Philostorg. h. e. II. 5.

CHAPTER SECOND.

HERETICS.

§ 57.

MONTANISM AND THE CONTROVERSY CONCERNING EASTER.

The Western church, being itself poor in theological productions, was the more open to those from abroad, and there were few of the parties in the Eastern church that did not here find followers. This was especially the case with Montanism, which, without causing any absolute division of the church, had not only found many friends,[1] but was exercising a very considerable influence upon its doctrines.[2]

The bishop of Rome was actually on the point of receiving into church-communion the Asiatic Montanists, who had been shut out from the churches of their own country, when Praxeas, a Confessor, [vid. § 52, p. 108 — Tr.] arrived from Asia (about A. D. 192), and succeeded in producing such a change in the feeling towards the Montanists, that all communion with them was forborne.[3] Thus began in the West also the controversy concerning Montanism,[4] the chief defender of which was *Q. S. F. Tertullian*, Presbyter at Carthage, and the earliest Latin ecclesiastical writer of any note; a man strict in his views, violent in his feelings, and of a rich, though sometimes too gross, imagination. In the heat of controversy the Montanistic tendency of Tertullian became more and more decided,[5] and his

---

1 See above, § 46: comp. below, note 6.

2 See § 52, note 31.

3 *Tertull. adv. Praxean*, c. 1: Nam idem (Praxeas) tunc episcopum Romanum (without doubt Victor), agnoscentem jam prophetias Montani, Priscæ, Maximillæ, et ex ea agnitione pacem ecclesiis Asiæ et Phrygiæ inferentem: falsa de ipsis prophetis et ecclesiis eorum adseverando, et præcessorum ejus auctoritates defendendo: coëgit et literas pacis revocare jam emissas, et a proposito recipiendorum charismatum concessare.

4 An important point in this controversy is given by *Tertull. de pudicit.* c. 1: Audio etiam edictum esse propositum, et quidem peremptorium: Pontifex scilicet Maximus, Episcopus Episcoporum, edicit: Ego et mœchiæ et fornicationis delicta pœnitentia functis dimitto. Following Petavius (not. ad Epiph. hær. 59. p. 228), it is usually supposed that the bishop here referred to is the Roman bishop, Zephyrinus (A. D. 197–217). This is not improbable; but still no conclusions are to be drawn from the title here used, as to the rank of the bishop meant. It means only that the said bishop had usurped the rights of the high priests of Christianity, of Christ; and notwithstanding this ironical title, it is possible that the passage may refer to some very obscure person.

5 The most striking illustration of this is, that, *de pœn.* c. 7. seq., he still allows of penitence once after baptism, see § 52, note 31; but, *de pudicit.* c. 16: Nemo seducat seipsum, i. e. nemo præsumat vitiatum Deo redintegrari denuo posse: —

followers continued to diverge further from the doctrine of the church, till at length in the West also a separate Montanistic sect was formed.[6] In the mean time, however, the whole church had become deeply imbued with the spirit of Montanism, whilst the opposite errors, into which Praxeas [7] and the Roman Presbyter, Caius,[8] were led, operated no doubt in its favor. Hence, though Montanism was from this time nominally condemned in the Western church, its influence is distinctly seen; [9] for not only do we find the strictness and tendency to lay great stress on external rules, by which the Montanists were dis-

---

delicta ista — post lavacrum irremissibilia. Comp. *Hieronymus in catal. c.* 53, *de Tertull.:* Hic cum usque ad mediam ætatem presbyter Ecclesiæ permansisset, invidia postea et contumeliis clericorum Romanæ Ecclesiæ ad Montani dogma delapsus. The historical connexion suggested above explains how this change is to be understood. comp. *J. G. Hoffmann* Tertulliani, quæ supersunt, omnia in Montanismo scripta videri. Vitemb. 1738. 4to. *Moshemii* dissertt. ad hist. eccl. pertinentt. vol. I. p. 54, not. *J. A. Noesselt* de vera ætate scriptorum quæ supersunt Q. Sept. Tertulliani dissertt. III. Hal. 1757 seq. 4to. (reprinted in *Ejusd.* tres commentationes ad hist. eccl. pertinentes. Halæ. 1817. 8vo. p. 1 seq.) Neander's Antignosticus, Geist des Tertullianus, and Einleitung zu dessen Schriften. Berlin. 1825. 8vo.

6 Particularly important for the history of the controversy is *Tertull. lib. de virginibus velandis.* In support of his demand, virgines nostras velari oportere, ex quo transitum ætatis suæ fecerint, and to answer the argument brought against him from custom, he appeals to the custom of the apostolic churches in Greece, and other countries: Non possumus respuere consuetudinem, quam damnare non possumus, utpote non extraneam, quia non extraneorum: cum quibus scilicet communicamus jus pacis et nomen fraternitatis. Una nobis et illis fides, unus Deus, idem Christus, eadem spes, eadem lavacri sacramenta. Semel dixerim, una ecclesia sumus. Hence it follows that this book was written before the division in the church, as both the contending parties are spoken of as belonging to the same church. *Cap.* 3 describes how the controversy sprung up, and the parties gradually became more and more embittered: Tamen tolerabilius apud nos ad usque proxime: utrique consuetudine communicabatur. Arbitrio permissa res erat, ut quæque voluisset aut tegi aut prostitui, sicut et nubere: quod et ipsum neque cogitur, neque prohibetur. Contenta erat veritas pacisci cum consuetudine, ut tacite sub consuetudinis nomine frueretur se vel ex parte. Sed quoniam cœperat agnitio proficere, ut per licentiam utriusque moris indicium melioris partis emergeret: statim ille adversarius bonorum multoque institutorum opus suum fecit. Ambiunt virgines hominum, adversus virgines Dei, nuda plane fronte, in temerariam audaciam excitatæ, et virgines videntur. — Scandalizamur, inquiunt, quia aliæ aliter incedunt, et malunt scandalizari quam provocari etc. On the contrary, *adv. Praxean,* c 1: Et nos quidem postea agnitio paracleti, atque defensio disjunxit a Psychicis.

7 See below, § 58.

8 A cotemporary of *Zephyrinus,* according to *Euseb. h. e.* II. 25, of his διάλογος πρὸς Πρόκλον (τῆς κατὰ Φρύγας αἱρέσεως ὑπερμαχοῦντα, *Euseb.* VI. 20), Fragments *Euseb.* II. 25, III. 28 and 31. comp. *Photii bibl. cod.* 48, *Routh reliqu. sacr. vol. II. p.* 1 seq. He attributed the doctrine of the Millennium and the Apocalypse to Cerinthus. *Euseb.* III. 28.

9 It is remarkable that the Montanists *Perpetua* and *Felicitas,* who were martyred in Carthage, A. D. 202, and their memoirs written by a Montanist (see in Ruinart), were always held in high repute in the African church. cf. *Augustini sermo I in natali Perpetuæ et Felicitatis.* The Montanistic character of these memoirs (Acta) is satisfactorily shown by Valerius (Acta S. S. Perpet. et Felicit. Paris. 1664. 8vo. in the Preface). So *Basnage* (Annales Polit. Eccles. T. II. p. 224 seq.), and *Th. Ittig* (diss. de hæresiarchis ævi Apostol. et apostolico

tinguished,[10] but what is still more striking, the writings of the Montanistic Tertullian (+ about A. D. 220) were always held in high estimation, and became the model for all succeeding Latin ecclesiastical writers.[11]

With the rejection of Montanism at Rome was probably connected Victor's attack upon the Asiatic mode of celebrating Easter (vid. § 52).[12] He called upon the bishops of Asia Minor to conform to the customs of the West in this matter, and, on their refusing to comply with his demand, broke off all communication with them.[13] In this he was supported by the bishops in Palestine, in Pontus, in Gaul, and by the bishop of Corinth. But others, and amongst them Irenæus,

---

proximi. Lips. 1690. 4to. Sect. II. c. 13, § 28): and even *J. A. Orsi* diss. apolog. pro SS. Perpetua et Felicitatis orthodoxia adv. S. Basnagium. Florent. 1728. 4to., admits the Montanistic principles of the author of the Acta. Comp. especially *Act. cap.* 1: Itaque et nos, qui sicut prophetias, ita et visiones novas pariter repromissas et agnoscimus et honoramus, etc. — That these Montanists should have been considered as members of the church, can only be accounted for by supposing that, at the time of their death, the separation had not yet taken place, though the controversy between the two parties had begun. Undoubtedly, however, the high estimation in which their writings were held must have contributed to nourish a Montanistic spirit.

10 For instance, the principle which was retained in the African church till the time of Cyprian, (*Tertull. de pudic. c.* 12) quod neque idololatriæ neque sanguini pax ab Ecclesiis redditur (see above, § 52, note 31). Neander's Antignosticus, S. 262. The Spanish church, which seems to have adopted the African for its model, declared this principle in its greatest strictness, as late as the *Concilium Illiberitanum* (about A. D. 305), ordaining with regard to those found guilty of idolatry, magic, adultery, incest, etc.: placuit nec in fine communionem accipere (can. 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 10, etc). — The error, against which *Cyprian* inveighs (Epist. 63 ad Cæcilium), quod aliquis existimet, sequendam esse quorundam consuetudinem, si qui in præteritum in calice Dominico aquam solam offerendam putaverint, may also, very possibly, have sprung from the Montanistic errors.

11 *Hieron.* l. c. numquam Cyprianum absque Tertulliani lectione unum diem præterisse: ac sibi (notario) crebro dicere, *Da magistrum*, Tertullianum videlicet significans. His works (written A. D. 197–211): 1. Against unbelievers, Apologeticus adv. gentes, libri II. ad nationes, de testimonio animæ, ad Scapulam, adv. Judæos. 2. Against Heretics, adv. Praxean, adv. Marcionem libb. V., adv. Valentinianos, de præscriptione hæreticorum, adv. Hermogenem. 3. Ascetic writings, the later of these expressly against the Psychics: ad Martyres, de spectaculis, de idololatria, de oratione, de baptismo, lib. II. ad uxorem, — de corona militis, libb. II. de cultu feminarum, de fuga in persecutione, de patientia, de virginibus velandis, de jejuniis, de pudicitia, cæt. — Ed. by *Nic. Rigaltius.* Paris. 1641. rep. *Ph. Priorius.* Paris. 1695. fol. Small edition by *J. S. Semler.* Hal. 1770–76. 6 Bde. 8vo.

12 Some light seems to be thrown on this by the *Appendix ad Tertull. de præscript. hæret. c.* 53: Est præterea his omnibus etiam Blastus accedens, qui latenter Judaismum vult introducere. Pascha enim dicit non aliter custodiendum esse, nisi secundum legem Moysi quartadecima mensis. This Blastus appeared at Rome (*Euseb.* V. 15), and Irenæus addressed to him an ἐπιστολὴ περὶ σχίσματος (*Euseb.* V. 20). From Eusebius it is evident that he did not agree in opinion with the Gnostic Florinus, and he may, not improbably, have been an ultra-Montanist. The Asiatic Montanists have always retained the mode of celebrating the Passover, which he advocated; see *Chrysostom. homil.* 156.

13 Euseb. h. e. V. 23–25.

reproved him for his haste;[14] and by their interference peace was once more restored, each party being left unmolested to their own choice until the Council of Nice.[15]

§ 58.

MONARCHIANS.

C. D. A. Martini Versuch einer pragmat. Geschichte des Dogma von der Gottheit Christi in den vier ersten Jahrhunderten. Rostock. Th. 1. 1800. 8vo. p. 128 seq. — F. Schleiermacher on the opposed doctrines of Sabellius and Athanasius concerning the Divinity (in Schleiermacher's, De Wette's, and Lücke's theol. Zeitschrift. Heft 3. Berlin. 1822. p. 295). [Vid. also Neander's Kirchengeschichte, Bd. 1. Abth. 3. p. 991 seq. — Tr.]

In opposition to the usual theory of the distinct personality of the Logos, which was thought inconsistent with the Divine Unity, it had been maintained by some of the Asiatic Christians, as early as the second century, that the Logos was only an emanation of God's power, or God himself in a particular relation;[1] nor had this view as yet been thought inadmissible. It was first introduced at Rome by

---

14 Euseb. V. 24: ἀλλ' οὐ πᾶσί γε τοῖς ἐπισκόποις ταῦτ' ἠρέσκετο. ἀντιπαρακελεύονται δῆπα αὐτῷ, τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης καὶ τῆς πρὸς τοὺς πλησίον ἑνώσεως καὶ ἀγάπης φρονεῖν. φέρονται δὲ καὶ αἱ τούτων φωναὶ, πληκτικώτερον καθαπτομένων τοῦ Βίκτορος. Ἐν οἷς καὶ ὁ Εἰρηναῖος ἐκ προσώπου ὧν ἡγεῖτο κατὰ τὴν Γαλλίαν ἀδελφῶν ἐπιστέλλας, — τῷ γε μὴν Βίκτορι προσηκόντως, ὡς μὴ ἀσκόπτοι ὅλας ἐκκλησίας θεοῦ ἀρχαίου ἔθους παράδοσιν ἐπιτηρούσας, πλεῖστα ἕτερα παραινεῖ.

15 According to *Athanasius de Synodis*, c. 5, it was one of the causes of the calling of the Council of Nice, that οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Συρίας, καὶ Κιλικίας, καὶ Μεσοποταμίας ἐχώλευον περὶ τὴν ἑορτὴν, καὶ μετὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐποίουν τὸ Πάσχα. cf. *Euseb. de vita Const.* III. c. 5.

1 *Justini dial. c. Tryph.* c. 128. [γινώσκω τινὰς λέγειν] ἄπμητον καὶ ἀχώριστον τοῦ πατρὸς ταύτην τὴν δύναμιν [τὸν λόγον] ὑπάρχειν, ὅνπερ τρόπον τὸ τοῦ ἡλίου φασὶ φῶς ἐπὶ γῆς εἶναι ἄπμητον καὶ ἀχώριστον ὄντος τοῦ ἡλίου ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ· καὶ ὅταν δύσῃ, συναποφέρεται τὸ φῶς· οὕτως ὁ πατὴρ, ὅταν βούληται, λέγουσι, δύναμιν αὐτοῦ προπηδᾷν ποιεῖ· καὶ ὅταν βούληται, πάλιν ἀναστέλλει εἰς ἑαυτόν. Κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους ποιεῖν αὐτὸν διδάσκουσιν. In like manner, the Clementines *hom.* XVI. c. 12: Εἷς ἐστιν, ὁ τῇ αὐτοῦ σοφίᾳ εἰπών· ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον· ἢ δὲ σοφία, ὥσπερ ἰδίῳ πνεύματι, αὐτὸς ἀεὶ συνίχαιρεν. ἤνωται μὲν ὡς ψυχὴ τῷ θεῷ, ἐκτίνεται δὲ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, ὡς χεὶρ δημιουργοῦσα τὸ πᾶν. — κατὰ γὰρ ἔκτασιν καὶ συστολὴν ἡ μονὰς δυὰς εἶναι νομίζεται. We have nearly the same account in *Athenagoras legat. pro Christ.* c. 10. Vid. Münscher's Dogmengesch. I. 407. Münter's Dogmengesch. I. 430. — Somewhat different, Scriptor XII. testam. Patriarch.: Κύριος ὁ θεὸς μέγας τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ φαινόμενος ἐπὶ γῆς ὡς ἄνθρωπος [Sym. 6.]. τὸ πάθος τοῦ Ὑψίστου [Levi 4.]. cf. *Nützsch* de testamentis XII. Patriarch. p. 29. Cf. *Epiphanius hær.* LXII. c. 2, as to the *Evangelium Ægyptiorum*: ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ πολλὰ τοιαῦτα ὡς ἐν παραβύστῳ μυστηριωδῶς ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἀναφέρεται, ὡς αὐτοῦ δηλοῦντος τοῖς μαθηταῖς, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι Πατέρα, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι Υἱὸν, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι Πνεῦμα. Comp. Neander's Antignosticus, S. 467 seq.

Praxeas; and, though violently opposed by Tertullian at Carthage,[2] he was not otherwise molested.[3] But Theodotus, *the tanner*, who came to Rome about the same time from Byzantium, and taught the simple humanity of Christ, was without hesitation excluded from the Church. His school (Theodotus, the *money-changer*, Asclepiades, Natalius, the Confessor) continued to exist in Rome for some time,[4] and by the similarity of their tenets brought the theory of Praxeas into such evil repute, that, when it was afterwards revived by *Artemon*, he was included in the same class with the Theodosians, and attacked as a heretic in various writings.[5] Even in Asia, whence this system first came, it was now looked upon as heresy, and *Noëtus* was excommunicated at

---

2 *Tertullianus adv. Praxean*, c. 1: Nam iste primus ex Asia hoc genus perversitatis intulit homo. — Duo negotia diaboli Praxeas Romæ procuravit: prophetiam expulit, et hæresin intulit, Paracletum fugavit, et patrem crucifixit. — c. 20: Nam sicut in veteribus nihil aliud tenent quam *Ego deus et alius præter me non est* (Es. 45, 5): ita in Evangelio responsionem domini ad Philippum tuentur, *Ego et pater unum sumus*, et *Qui me viderit vidit et patrem*, et *Ego in patre et pater in me* (Joh. x. 30, xiv. 9, 10). His tribus capitulis totum instrumentum utriusque testamenti volunt cedere. — c. 3: Itaque duos et tres jam jactitant a nobis prædicari, se vero unius Dei cultores præsumunt. — *Monarchiam* inquiunt tenemus (c. 10, vanissimi isti *Monarchiani*). — c. 5: Duos unum volunt esse, ut idem Pater et filius habeatur. — c. 2: Itaque post tempus pater natus, et pater passus: ipse Deus, dominus omnipotens, Jesus Christus prædicatur. On the other hand, c. 27: Æque in una persona utrumque distinguunt, patrem et filium, dicentes filium carnem esse, id est hominem, i. e. Jesum: patrem autem spiritum, i. e. Deum, i. e. Christum. and c. 29: Ergo, inquis, et nos eadem ratione dicentes patrem, qua vos filium, non blasphemamus in Dominum Deum: non enim ex divina sed ex humana substantia mortuum dicimus. Neander's Antignosticus, S. 481.

3 *Tertull. adv. Praxean*, 1: Denique caverat pristinum doctor de emendatione sua: et manet chirographum apud Psychicos, apud quos tunc gesta res est: exinde silentium. *Appendix l. de præscript.* 53: Post hos omnes etiam Praxeas quidem hæresin introduxit, quam Victorinus (Victor?) corroborare curavit. cf. note 5.

4 Vid. the extracts from the anonymous work against Artemon, in Euseb. V. 28. *Append. l. de præscr.* 53: Ex spiritu quidem sancto natum, ex virgine, sed hominem solitarium atque nudum, nullo alio præ ceteris nisi sola justitiæ autoritate. Alter post hunc *Theodotus* (trapezita) hæreticus erupit, qui et ipse introduxit alteram sectam, et ipsum hominem Christum — — inferiorem esse quam Melchisedech, eo quod dictum sit de Christo: *Tu es sacerdos in æternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech* (Hebr. vii. 21). Nam illum Melchisedech præcipuæ gratiæ cœlestem esse virtutem, eo quod agat Christus pro hominibus, deprecator et advocatus ipsorum factus: Melchisedech facere pro cœlestibus angelis atque virtutibus. (*Melchisedeciani.*) — *Epiphanius* (hær. 54, 1) holds the Theodosians for an ἀπόσπασμα ἐκ τῆς Ἀλόγου αἱρέσεως (τῶν Ἀλόγων). — According to *Theodoret*, (hær. fab. comp. 2, 5), they were very early accused of corrupting the Scriptures.

5 For extracts from the σπούδασμα κατὰ τῆς Ἀρτέμωνος αἱρέσεως, vid. Euseb. V. 28. They represent the Artemonites as asserting: τοὺς μὲν προτέρους ἅπαντας καὶ αὐτοὺς τοὺς ἀποστόλους παρειληφέναι τὲ καὶ διδιδαχέναι ταῦτα, ἃ νῦν οὗτοι λέγουσι· καὶ τετηρῆσθαι τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ κηρύγματος μέχρι τῶν Βίκτορος χρόνων, — ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ διαδόχου αὐτοῦ Ζεφυρίνου παρακεκιβάρχθαι τὴν ἀλήθειαν. — *Theodoret* (hær. fab. comp. 2, 5) gives extracts from the σμικρὸς Λαβύρινθος, which by some are falsely ascribed to *Origen*. That this σπούδασμα of Eusebius was the Λαβύρινθος of Theodoret (vid. Nicephorus hist. eccl. 4, 24), and that Caius was the author of both works (vid. Photius cod. 48), are mere conjectures.

Smyrna (about the year 230) for holding to it.[6] On the other hand, Beryllus, bishop of Bostra, was induced to abandon it by Origen, at a council held in Bostra in the year 244.[7] Soon after, however, (A. D. 250–260) it was brought forward in a new form[8] by *Sabellius*, a presbyter at Ptolemais. Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, endeavoured in vain to confute him in personal interviews and by letters, and in the process of his argument was led to positions almost equally irreconcilable with the doctrines of the church. Traces of the Sabellians are found in Rome and Mesopotamia as late as the fourth century.

Still greater offence was given by *Paul of Samosata*, bishop of Antioch (from A. D. 260), who at the same time exhibited a vanity and love of display hitherto unexampled in a Christian bishop. His notion of the Deity was nearly the same with that of Sabellius, but Jesus he supposed to be a man begotten by the Holy Ghost, in whom the wisdom of God peculiarly dwelt.[9] Various councils were held to try his

---

6 *Theodoret.* hær. fab. comp. 3, 3, supposes *Epigonus* and *Cleomenes* to have preceded Noëtus. His doctrine was: *ἕνα φασὶν εἶναι θεὸν καὶ πατέρα, τῶν ὅλων δημιουργόν· ἀφανῆ μὲν ὅταν ᾖθέλῃ, φαινόμενον δὲ ἡνίκα ἂν βούληται. καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἀόρατον εἶναι καὶ ὁρώμενον, καὶ γεννητὸν καὶ ἀγέννητον· ἀγέννητον μὲν ἐξ ἀρχῆς, γεννητὸν δὲ ὅτε ἐκ παρθένου γεννηθῆναι ἠθέλησε· ἀπαθῆ καὶ ἀθάνατον, καὶ πάλιν αὖ παθητὸν καὶ θνητόν. ἀπαθὴς γὰρ ὤν, φησὶ, τὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ πάθος ἠθέλησας ὑπέμεινε. τοῦτον καὶ Υἱὸν ὀνομάζουσι καὶ Πατέρα, πρὸς τὰς χρείας τούτο κἀκεῖνο καλούμενον.* He was opposed by *Hippolytus* contra hæresin Noeti [ed. Fabricii. T. II. p. 5]; vid. *Epiphanius* hær. 57.

7 *Euseb.* VI. 33. His doctrine was: *τὸν σωτῆρα καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν μὴ προϋφεστάναι κατ' ἰδίαν οὐσίας περιγραφὴν πρὸ τῆς εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἐπιδημίας· μηδὲ μὴν θεότητα ἰδίαν ἔχειν, ἀλλ' ἐμπολιτευομένην αὐτῷ μόνην τὴν πατρικήν.*

8 *Basilius* Epist. 210: *τὸν αὐτὸν θεὸν ἕνα τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ [τῇ ὑποστάσει,* Ep. 214.] *ὄντα, πρὸς τὰς ἑκάστοτε παραπιπτούσας χρείας μεταμορφούμενον (μετασχηματιζόμενον,* Ep. 235. *προσωποποιούμενον,* Ep. 214.), *νῦν μὲν ὡς πατέρα, νῦν δὲ ὡς υἱόν, νῦν δὲ ὡς πνεῦμα ἅγιον διαλέγεσθαι.* *Theodoret.* hær. fab. comp. 2, 9. *ἐν μὲν τῇ παλαιᾷ ὡς πατέρα νομοθετῆσαι, ἐν δὲ τῇ καινῇ ὡς υἱὸν ἐναυθρωπῆσαι· ὡς πνεῦμα δὲ ἅγιον τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ἐπιφοιτῆσαι.* — (*τρία πρόσωπα*). With more exactness the Alexandrians: Pseudo-*Greg. Thaumat.*: *ἡ κατὰ μέρος πίστις*: Sabellium fugimus, qui dicit eundem esse patrem et filium, patrem quidem dicit eum, qui loquitur, filium vero verbum in patre manens et tempore creationis patefactum, completis vero rebus in Deum remeans. Idem dicit de Spiritu Sancto. *Athanas. c. Arian. Or.* IV. 12: *ἡ μονὰς πλατυνθεῖσα γέγονε τριάς.* ib. 13: *συστέλλεσθαι καὶ πάλιν ἐκτείνεσθαι τὸν θεόν.* (concerning this *ἔκτασις καὶ συστολὴ* vid. *Clementin. hom.* XVI. c. 12, above, note 1). ib. 25: *ὥσπερ διαιρέσεις χαρισμάτων εἰσὶ, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα, οὕτω καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὁ αὐτὸς μέν ἐστι, πλατύνεται δὲ εἰς υἱὸν καὶ πνεῦμα.* cf. *Alexandri Alex. epist. ad Alex. Constant.* ap. Theodoret. h. e. 1, 3: *Ἰησοῦν Χριστον — γεννηθέντα — οὐ κατὰ τὰς τῶν σωμάτων ὁμοιότητας, ταῖς τομαῖς, ἢ ταῖς ἐκ διαιρέσεων ἀποῤῥοίαις, ὥσπερ Σαβελλίῳ καὶ Βαλεντίνῳ δοκεῖ.* *Arii epist. ad Alexandrum Alex.* ap. Epiphan. hæres. 69: *οὐδ' ὡς Σαβέλλιος ὁ τὴν μονάδα διαιρῶν υἱοπάτορα εἶπεν.* The views of Sabellius are best expressed, perhaps, by Epiphanius, hær. 62, 1: *ἐν μιᾷ ὑποστάσει τρεῖς ἐνεργείαι.* namely, *τὸ τῆς περιφερείας σχῆμα,* or *τὸ εἶδος πάσης τῆς ὑποστάσεως, τὸ φωτιστικὸν* and *τὸ θέλον.* [Lardner's Cred. Pt. II. Vol. I. p. 558. Especially Murdock's Mosheim. I, 241. — Tr.]

9 His history is found Euseb. h. e. 7, 27–30. — Of the writings ascribed to him, 1. Epistola Episcop. Concilii Antioch. ad Paulum Samos. 2. Dionysii Alex. epistola ad Paul. S. 3. Pauli S. X quæstiones, et Dionysii responsiones

opinions; at the last of which (A. D. 269) his heresy, hitherto disguised under ambiguous expressions, was at length exposed by Malchion, and he was deprived of his office.[10] Such was his influence with his patroness Zenobia, however, that his successor Domnus found it impossible to displace him, until her defeat by Aurelian, A. D. 272.[11] The followers of Paul of Samosata (Samosateniani, Pauliani, Paulianistæ,) are found as late as the 4th century.[12]

§ 59.

MANICHÆANS.

Sources: *Archelai* (Bishop of Cascar, about A. D. 278) Acta disputationis cum Manete,[1] (first printed in *L. A. Zaccagnii* collectaneis monumentorum vet. eccl. Græcæ et Lat. Romæ. 1698. 4to., then in *J. A. Fabricii* ed. opp. Hippolyti, vol. II., *Gallandii* bibl. Patr. vol. III., *Routh* reliq. sacr. vol. IV. p. 119 seq.) — *Titi Bostrensis* (about A. D. 360) libb. IV. contra Manichæos (in *Henr. Canisii* lection. antiquis, ed. *Basnage*, T. I). — *Augustini Hipponensis* contra Fortunatum, contra Adimantum, contra Faustum libb. 33, de actis cum Felice Man. libb. 2, and other writings, all contained in vol. 8th of the Benedictine edition.

Works: *Is. de Beausobre* hist. crit. de Manichée et du Manichéisme. Amst. 1734. 39. 2 vols. 4to. — *J. L. Moshemii* comm. de rebus Christ. ante Constantin. M. p. 728–903. — J. S. Semler's Einleitung zu Baumgarten's

---

(in *Mansi* concil. collect. T. I. p. 1033 seq.); the first is of doubtful authority, the two last spurious. Epiphan. hær. 65, 1: ἐν θεῷ ἀεὶ ὄντα τὸν αὐτοῦ Λόγον, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ, ὥσπερ ἐν ἀνθρώπου καρδίᾳ ὁ ἴδιος λόγος· μὴ εἶναι δὲ τὸν υἱὸν ἰνυπόστατον, ἀλλὰ ἐν αὐτῷ θεῷ (ἐπιστήμην ἀνυπόστατον, Epist. Episc. ad Paul.) — ἐλθόντα δὲ τὸν Λόγον καὶ ἐνοικήσαντα ἐν Ἰησοῦ ἀνθρώπῳ ὄντι. — οὐ φάσκει δὲ οὗτος κατὰ τὸν Νόητον τὸν Πατέρα πεπονθέναι, ἀλλὰ φησὶ, ἐλθὼν ὁ Λόγος ἐνήργησε μόνος, καὶ ἀνῆλθε πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα. cf. *J. G. Feuerlini* diss. de hæresi Pauli Samos. Goett. 1741. *J. G. Ehrlich* diss. de erroribus Pauli Samos. Lips. 1745.

[10] The decision of the Council, μὴ εἶναι ὁμοούσιον τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ πατρὶ, first mentioned in a letter of the Semiarians about A. D. 358, is granted by *Athanasius* de synod. 43.; *Hilarius* de synod. 86.; *Basilius* epist. 52: on the other side *Prudentius Maranus* diss. sur les Semiariens (in *Voigtii* bibl. hist. hæresiologicæ, T. II. p. 159), and *Feuerlini* diss. Dei filium patri esse ὁμοούσιον, antiqui ecclesiæ doctores in Conc. Ant. utrum negarint. Goetting. 1755. 4to. *Schleiermacher* l. c. p. 387, note, thinks that this expression was first used by Sabellius. That it certainly occurs in the Sabellian controversy is shown below, § 62, note 6.

[11] Remarkable order of Aurelian, Euseb. VII. 30, 9: τούτοις νεῖμαι τὸν οἶκον, οἷς ἂν οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν καὶ τὴν Ῥωμαίων πόλιν ἐπίσκοποι τοῦ δόγματος ἐπιστέλλοιεν.

[12] The usual names for all those who maintained τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, were (according to *Athanas. de Synodis*, c. 7) Πατροπασσιανοὶ μὲν παρὰ Ρωμαίοις, Σαβελλιανοὶ δὲ παρ' ἡμῖν.

[1] Fragments of the Greek orignal in *Epiphanius* (hær. 66). Proved spurious by Beausobre I. p. 129 seq. — but supposed to be genuine as early as Jerome, (catal. c. 72.) cf. *Fabricii bibl. græca, ed. Harles*, vol. VII. p. 275 seq.

Untersuchung theologischer Streitigkeiten. Bd. 1. Halle. 1762. 4to. — K. A. Freih. v. Reichlinn Meldegg die Theologie des Magiers Manes und ihr Ursprung. Frankfort a. M. 1825. 8vo. — Neander's Kirchengesch. Bd. 1. Abth. 2. S. 813 ff. [Lardn. Cred. P. 2. vol. 3. p. 364-753. — Tr.]

As the Christianity of the Gnostics had so much in common with the system of Zoroaster, it is not wonderful that the Persian Christians, amongst whom Gnosticism had long prevailed,[2] should have been led to combine them. The religion of the Zend having degenerated into a gross Dualism and mere ceremonial worship under the Arsacides, their successors, the Sassanides, were now making every effort to restore its ancient purity (A. D. 227 seq.); and in the assemblies of the Magi the supremacy of the one great first principle (*Zeruane akerene*) had been acknowledged, and Dualism with its adherents (Magusæans) condemned. It is probable, that this division amongst the believers in Parsism first suggested to Manes the idea of uniting Christianity with the system of the rejected Magusæans.[3] In the name of this man (*Mani* — *Cubricus*, *Manes*, *Manichæus*) as well as in their accounts of him, the writers in the East differ from those in the West;[4] agreeing only in the following particulars: — that he was hated by the Magi, persecuted by the Persian kings, compelled to flee, and at length, according to the Orientals, by order of king Baharam, or Vararanes, (A. D. 272 - 275,) most barbarously put to death as a corrupter of the national religion, in a castle which the Eastern writers call Dascarrah, and the Western Arabion.

The system of Manes begins with supposing two eternal and coexistent kingdoms, the kingdom of light, and the kingdom of darkness. These border on each other, and are under the dominion, the one of God and the other of the Demon, or Hyle. In a war between the two kingdoms, the borders having been passed, and the material or matter of the two worlds mingled, God commanded the living spirit (ζῶν πνεῦμα) to fashion our world out of this mingled matter, to the end that the portion belonging to the kingdom of light (*anima et Jesus patibilis*) might be gradually separated, and the old boundaries restored. This process is conducted by two exalted natures, or entities, from the kingdom of light, Christ (whom Manes calls in preference *dextra luminis*, &c.) and the Holy Ghost; the former residing in the sun and moon (*naves*), and the latter in the air. Their efforts are opposed by the Demon and the evil spirits, who are fixed to the

---

2 Comp. § 44. *Sim. de Vries* de origine et progressu relig. Christ. in veteri Persarum regno, in *Barkey Museum Haganum*, T. III. p. 288 seq.

3 *Thom. Hyde* historia religionis vett. Persarum et Parthorum et Medorum. Oxon. 1700. (new ed. Lond. 1760). 4to. p. 280 seq. — Abbé *Foucher* über das System des Manes in J. F. Kleukers Anhange zum Zend-Avesta. Bd. 1. Th. 2. S. 186 ff. — *Silv. de Sacy* Mémoires sur diverses antiquités de la Perse. Paris. 1793. 4to. p. 42.

4 The Orientals are contained in *Herbelot* bibliothèque orientale. Paris. 1697. fol. (new ed. Haag. 1777, 1778. 3 T. in 4to.) Art. Mani. – The Western writers have all borrowed from *Archelai* Act. disput. cum Manete.

stars. In each individual there is a soul of light, and an evil soul,[5] and his aim should be to secure to the former the sway over the latter, to unite with it as many as possible of the elements of light, which are scattered every where, and especially in certain plants, and thus to free it from the fetters of the evil principle, and prepare the way for its return to the kingdom of light.[6] After the Demon, or ruler of the Hyle, had long led men astray by false religions (Judaism and Paganism), Christ descended from the sun in a seeming body, to lead them to the worship of the true God, and by his instructions to help the souls of light in their struggle for liberty. But these instructions were never fully understood even by the Apostles, and after his death still more misinterpreted by his followers;[7] and for this reason he promised a still greater apostle, the Paraclete, who appeared in the person of Manes.[8]

---

5 A notion common amongst the ancient Persians: comp. *Xenoph. Cyropæd.* VI. c. 1. § 21: δύο γὰρ σαφῶς ἔχω ψυχάς. — οὐ γὰρ δὴ μία γε οὖσα ἅμα ἀγαθή τέ ἐστι καὶ κακή, οὐδ' ἅμα καλῶν τε καὶ αἰσχρῶν ἔργων ἐρᾷ, καὶ ταυτὰ ἅμα βούλεταί τε καὶ οὐ βούλεται πράττειν· ἀλλὰ δηλονότι δύο ἐστὸν ψυχὰ, καὶ ὅταν μὲν ἡ ἀγαθὴ κρατῇ, τὰ καλὰ πράττεται· ὅταν δὲ ἡ πονηρὰ, τὰ αἰσχρὰ ἐπιχειρεῖται. On the more modern views of the Persians, see *Kleuker's* App. to the Zend-Avesta. Bd. I. Th. 1. S. 261.

6 *Manes in epist. ad filium Menoch.* (ap. *Augustin.* op. imperf. lib. III. c. 172): Sicut animæ gignuntur animabus, ita figmentum corporis a corporis natura digeritur. Quod ergo nascitur de carne, caro est, et quod de spiritu, spiritus est: spiritum autem animam intellige. — (c. 177): Sive enim bonum geramus, non est carnis, — sive malum geramus, non est animæ. Hence the peculiar notions of the Manichæans with regard to freedom of the will and sin. *Fortunatus disp. II. cum Augustino:* Id est peccatum animæ, si post commonitionem Salvatoris nostri et sanam doctrinam ejus a contraria natura et inimica sui stirpe se non segregaverit anima. *Secundinus epist. ad Augustin.* § 2: (Anima) carnis commixtione ducitur, non propria voluntate. At si, cum se ipsam cognoverit, consentiat malo, et non se armet contra inimicum, voluntate sua pecavit. Quam si iterum pudeat errasse, paratum inveniet misericordiarum auctorem. Non enim punitur, quia peccavit, sed quia de peccato non doluit.

7 Contemptuously called Γαλιλαῖοι by *Manes epist. ad Oddam.* (in *Fabricii* bibl. græca, vol. V. p. 285).

8 *Manes* begins his *Epistola fundamenti* (ap. Augustinum contra epist. Manichæi, c. 5) thus: *Manichæus Apostolus Jesu Christi*, providentia Dei patris. Hæc sunt salubria verba de perenni et vivo fonte, quæ qui audierit et eisdem primum crediderit, deinde quæ insinuant custodierit, numquam erit morti obnoxius, verum æterna et gloriosa vita fruetur, cæt. — The Manichæan *Felix* (Augustin. de act. cum Felice I. 9): Paulus in altera epistola dicit: "Ex parte scimus et ex parte prophetamus: cum venerit autem quod perfectum est, abolebuntur ea, quæ ex parte dicta sunt (1 Cor. xiii. 9, 10)." Nos audientes Paulum hoc dicere, venit Manichæus cum prædicatione sua et suscepimus eum secundum quod Christus dixit: "Mitto vobis spiritum sanctum." — Et quia venit Manichæus, et per suam prædicationem docuit nos initium, medium, et finem: docuit nos de fabrica mundi, quare facta est, et unde facta est, et qui fecerunt: docuit nos quare dies et quare nox: docuit nos de cursu solis et lunæ: quia hoc in Paulo non audivimus, nec in cæterorum Apostolorum scripturis: hoc credimus, *quia ipse est Paracletus.* Itaque illud iterum dico, quod superius dixi: si audiero in altera scriptura, ubi Paracletus loquitur, de quo voluero interrogare, et docueris me, credo et renuntio. — Without doubt Manes made a distinction between the Holy Ghost and the Paraclete, but was misunderstood by the Catholics, (e. g. Euseb. h. e. 7, 31: τοστὶ μὲν τὸν παράκλητον καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον αὐτὸς ἑαυτὸν ἀνακηρύττων).

Some of the Manichæans rejected entirely the writings of the New Testament; others declared them to be interpolated.[9] They had also other pretended Apostolical writings,[10] and held the productions of Manes himself in the highest veneration.[11]

Their moral system prescribed a rigid self-denial, which had for its object to give to the good soul in man the sway over the bad soul. It was distinguished into the *signaculum oris*, *signaculum manûs*, and *signaculum sinûs*. But, as a rigid adherence to this system would have made an end of the whole sect in one generation, Manes divided his followers into two classes, the Electi (*τέλειοι*) and the Auditores (*κατηχούμενοι*), of whom the last were excused from the observance of the more severe rules. The worship of the Manichæans was extremely simple. They celebrated the Sunday only by fasting, and on the day of Manes's death observed a festival called *βῆμα*. The rites of baptism and the Lord's supper were confined to the Electi.

Manes sent out twelve Apostles to make converts, and some of the Electi were always abroad for this purpose. Still the most intimate union was preserved. At the head of the whole party was always some one person under whom were twelve Magistri, to whom again the seventy-two bishops of the separate churches were accountable. The historical form in which Manes pretended to explain so much that is beyond human conception, and the ascetic life of his followers, could not fail to attract much attention, and thus we find the Manichæans, soon after the death of their founder, carrying their doctrines into Africa Proconsularis, and even farther, in the Roman dominions. And this, though they were not only opposed by the true church, but persecuted with peculiar severity by the Heathen emperors[12] on account of their Persian origin.

---

9 *Faustus* (ap. Augustin. c. Faust. 33, 3): Nec ab ipso (Christo) hæc (Evangelia) sunt, nec ab ejus Apostolis scripta: sed multo post eorum assumtionem a nescio quibus, et ipsis inter se non concordantibus Semijudæis per famas opinionesque comperta sunt: qui tamen omnia eadem in Apostolorum Domini conferentes nomina, vel eorum, qui secuti Apostolos viderentur, errores ac mendacia sua *secundum eos* se scripsisse mentiti sunt. *Idem* (l. c. 32, 6): Paracletus ex novo testamento promissus docet, quid accipere ex eodem debeamus, et quid repudiare.

10 A catalogue of them, in part, no doubt, of later origin, *Timotheus* (presb. Constantinop. about 511) l. de iis qui ad ecclesiam accedunt, in *J. Meursii* variis divinis. Lugd. Bat. 1619. 4to. p. 117. — *τὸ κατὰ Θωμᾶν Εὐαγγέλιον· τὸ κατὰ Φίλιππον εὐαγγ.* *Leucii* Acta Apostol. (*Augustin.* de act. c. Felice 2, 6. *τῶν Ἀποστόλων περιόδοι.* Photii cod. 114) *ἡ πρὸς Λαοδικεῖς ἐπιστολή.*

11 B *βίβλος τῶν μυστηρίων* (Syriac in 22 divisions. Fragments in Titus Bostrensis and Epiphan. hær. 66, 14). B. *τῶν κεφαλαίων, τὸ ζῶν εὐαγγέλιον* (Oriental. *Erteng?*) *ὁ θησαυρὸς τῆς ζωῆς* (a fragm. Augustin. de natura boni 44, de Act. cum Felice I. 14). These four works Manes is said to have appropriated from the remains of *Scythianus*. Besides these there are several letters of his: *epistola fundamenti* (Augustini liber contra epist. Manichæi, quam vocant fundamenti), *Ep. ad filiam Menoch* (Fragments in August. opus imperfect. lib. III.), Ep. ad *Zebenam*, ad *Odan*, ad *Cudarum*. Fragments collected in *Fabricii* bibl. græca, vol. V. p. 284 seq. ed. nov. vol. VII. p. 315.

12 Comp. *Diocletian's Edict* against the Manichæans, addressed to Julian, proconsul of Africa, dat. prid. Kal. April. Alexandriæ, mentioned by *Ambrosiaster*

CHAPTER THIRD.

THEOLOGY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

I. IN THE EAST.

§ 60.

ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOL.

H. E. F. Guerike de schola, quæ Alexandriæ floruit, comm. hist. et theol. (PP. II. Halis Sax. 1824–25. 8vo.) Pars prior: de externa scholæ historia.

In the period before us the doctrines of the church were developed chiefly at Alexandria, at that time the seat of the sciences, where the Catholic teachers, brought into constant collision with Heathen and Heretics, were forced to enter more philosophically into the Christian doctrines. In this highly cultivated city, the necessity of something more than the usual instruction of Catechumens had been very early felt, as well for the philosophical proselytes, as for those who were in future to become teachers. In this manner, no doubt, distinguished men had often drawn around them great numbers of pupils; and thus prepared the way for the institution of the *Alexandrian Catechetical School*,[1] which, beginning just before the time of which we

ad 2 Tim. iii. 7, and contained in the *Mosaicarum et Romanarum legum collatio Tit. XV. c.* 3, as also in Jus civile Antejustinianeum præfatus est *G. Hugo.* Berolini. 1815. T. II. p. 1463. The text seems certainly to have somewhat suffered; but *Bilderdyk's* Emendation in the Commentatt. lat. tertiæ classis Instituti Reg. Belgici vol. II. Amstelod. 1820. p. 185, can scarcely be justified: — Quoniam nos, de quibus Solertia tua Serenitati nostræ retulit, Manichæos audivimus nuperrime, velut nova inopinata prodigia, in hunc mundum de Persica, adversaria nobis gente, progressa vel orta esse, et multa facinora ibi committere: populos namque quietos perturbare, nec non et civitatibus maxima detrimenta inferre: et verendum est, ne forte, ut fieri adsolet, accedente tempore conentur exsecrandis consuetudinibus et incestis legibus Persarum innocentioris naturæ homines, Romanam gentem modestam atque tranquillam, et universum orbem nostrum veluti venenis suis malevolis inficere, etc. — Jubemus namque auctores ac principes una cum abominandis scripturis eorum severiori pœnæ subjici, ita ut flammeis ignibus exurantur; consentaneos vero et usque adeo contentiosos capite puniri præcipimus, et eorum bona fisco nostro vindicari sancimus. Si qui sane etiam honorati, aut cujuslibet dignitatis vel majoris personæ ad hanc inauditam et turpem atque per omnia infamem sectam, vel ad doctrinam Persarum se transtulerunt, eorum patrimonia fisco nostro adsociari facies: ipsos quoque Focensibus vel Proconensibus metallis dari. Ut igitur stirpitus amputari radix hæc nequitiæ de sæculo beatissimo nostro possit, Devotio tua jussis ac statuis Tranquillitatis Nostræ maturius obsecundato. Remarks on this passage in *Bynkershoek* de relig. peregrina diss. II. *Cannegicter* ad fragm. vet. jurisprud. c. 24.

[1] *Euseb.* V. 10, (speaking of the time of Commodus): *ἡγεῖτο δὲ τηνικαῦτα τῆς τῶν πιστῶν αὐτόθι (κατ' Ἀλεξάνδρειαν) διατριβῆς ἀνὴρ κατὰ παιδείαν ἐνδοξότατος, ὄνομα αὐτῷ Πάνταινος· ἐξ ἀρχαίου ἔθους διδασκαλείου τῶν ἱερῶν λόγων παρ' αὐτοῖς*

are speaking, was now at the height of its prosperity, and through its distinguished teachers (*κατηχήσεων* magistri, *Hieron. cat.* c. 38), Pantænus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origenes, Heraclas, Dionysius,[2] (Pierius and Theognostus ?), was the source of all the advances made in Christian theology during this period. The Alexandrian school took its peculiar character from its very earliest teachers. Of Pantænus, indeed, we know nothing further than his name, and can only judge of him by his pupil Titus Flavius Clemens, on whose writings this character is plainly stamped. He presided over the school from the year 191 to 202, fled from the city in the persecution under Severus, and probably came back again afterwards (+ about 220).[3] But these peculiarities were first fully developed and matured by the great Origen (*ὁ χαλκέντερος*, Adamantinus), the son of the martyr Leonidas (+ 202). At the early age of eighteen he was a catechumen at the school in Alexandria, and had a high reputation abroad. But in the year 228 he offended his bishop, Demetrius, by being consecrated as Presbyter at Cæsarea, and, after his removal thither, was soon excluded by Demetrius from communion with the church for his peculiar opinions. The churches in Palestine, Arabia, and Achaia paid no

---

συνεσσῶτος, ὃ καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς παρατίνεται, καὶ πρὸς τῶν ἐν λόγῳ καὶ τῇ περὶ τὰ θεῖα σπουδῇ δυνατῶν συγκροτεῖσθαι παρειλήφαμεν. Still more fully, *Hieronymus* in catal. 36: Pantænus Stoicæ sectæ Philosophus, juxta quandam veterem in Alexandria consuetudinem, ubi a Marco Evangelista semper Ecclesiastici fuere Doctores, tantæ prudentiæ et eruditionis tam in Scripturis divinis, quam in sæculari literatura fuit, ut in Indiam quoque — mitteretur. Names: *τὸ τῆς κατηχήσεως διδασκαλεῖον* (*Euseb.* h. e. VI. 3, I. VI. 26), *τὸ ἱερὸν διδασκαλεῖον τῶν ἱερῶν μαθημάτων* (*Sozom.* h. e. III. 15), ecclesiastica schola (*Hieron. cat.* c. 38), schola *κατηχήσεων* (*ibid.* c. 69). *J. G. Michaelis* de scholæ Alexandrinæ sic dictæ catecheticæ origine, progressu, ac præcipuis doctoribus (*Symbolæ literariæ*, T. I. P. III. Bremæ. 1745. p. 195). The remarks of *J. Matter*, Essai historique sur l'école d'Alexandrie. Paris. 1820. T. II. 8, on this school are of no great weight. Comp. the work of Guerike, the title of which is prefixed to the paragraph. Neander's Kirchengeschichte I, III 899. Tr.]

2 This is the order according to *Eusebius* and others. On the other hand, *Philippi Sidetæ* (about 420) fragm. in *Henr. Dodwelli* dissertatt. in Irenæum. Oxon. 1689. 8vo. p. 490 seq.: *Athenagoras, Pantænus, Origenes, Heraclas, Dionysius, Clemens, Pierius, Theognostus, Serapion, Petrus Martyr, Macarius πολιτικός, Didymus, Rhodon.* But as early as *Socrates* hist. eccl. VI. c. 27, we read of Philip's History, *ὅτι τοὺς χρόνους τῆς ἱστορίας συγχέει.*

3 Writings: *λόγος προτρεπτικὸς πρὸς Ἕλληνας* — *παιδαγωγός*, 3 Books — *στρώματα* or *στρωματεῖς*, 8 books — *λόγος, τίς ὁ σῳζόμενος πλούσιος* (lib. qui dives salutem consequi possit. c. comm. *C. Segaar.* Traj. ad Rh. 1816. 8vo.). Unfortunately the *Ὑποτυπώσεις* in 8 books, which, according to the more modern orthodoxy, contained many *ἀσεβεῖς καὶ μυθώδεις λόγους* (see *Photius cod.* 109), is all lost but a few fragments. (Collected by Potter vol. II. p. 1006.) A small portion of it, Remarks on the Catholic Epistles, has been preserved in a Latin translation under the title *Adumbrationes Clem. Alex.* (best ed. *Potter* l. c.): probably the same of which *Cassiodorus de Institut. de lit.* c. 8, says that he had caused it to be made, ut exclusis quibusdam offendiculis purificata doctrina ejus securior possit hauriri. Comp. Lücke's Comm. über die Schriften Johannis. Th. 3. S. 298. — Opp. omnia ed. *J. Potter.* Oxon. 1715. 2 voll. fol. P. Hofstede de Groot diss. de *Clem. Alex.* 1826. 8vo. See Ersch and Gruber's Encycl. art. *Clemens.*

regard, however, to this measure of Demetrius, and Origen not only continued to act as Presbyter, but likewise gave instruction in the sciences. At the same time he was employed for twenty-eight years in revising the corrupted text of the Septuagint. He was twice invited to be present at Synods held for the purpose of trying heretics, and on both occasions he succeeded in reclaiming them (Beryllus of Bostra, in the year 244 — Arabici A. D. 248). So distinguished a man could hardly be overlooked in the persecutions. Once he escaped by flight in the persecution by Maximinus the Thracian, and took refuge with his friend Firmilianus, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia. Afterwards, however, in the persecution under Decius, he was so maltreated at Tyre, that he never recovered from the injuries he had received, and died in that city in the year 254.[4]

---

[4] On Origen's life, opinions, and writings, vid. *Pet. Dan. Huetii* Origeniana libb. III. prefixed to his edition of the Comm. reprinted in *de la Rue* vol. IV. Append. p. 79 seq. *Ceillier* histoire des auteurs sacrés et ecclés. T. II. p. 584 seq. — Writings: 1. Critical, which have become the model and source for all succeeding Greek commentators: σημειώσεις, scholia — τόμοι, commentarii — ὁμιλίαι. (on these three kinds of critical writings, vid. *Rufinus invectiv in Hieron. lib. II.* in Hieron. opp. ed. Martianay, T. IV. P. II. p. 416.) Orig. in sacr. script. commentaria, quæcunque græce reperiri potuerunt ed. *P. D. Huetius* Rothomagi. 1668. 2 voll. fol., reprinted at Paris. 1679. Coloniæ (Frankfort). 1685. fol. Most of the critical writings are extant only in the Latin translations of *Rufinus* and *Jerome.* — 2. κατὰ Κέλσου τόμοι ἡ (ed. G. Spencer, Cantabrig. 1658. 4to.) 3. περὶ ἀρχῶν libr. IV. in the Latin translation of Rufinus. (cf. *Rufini præf.* Interpretando sequor regulam prædecessorum, et ejus præcipue viri, cujus superius fecimus mentionem (Hieronymi), qui cum ultra LXX. libellos Origenis — transtulisset in Latinum, in quibus cum aliquanta offendicula inveniantur in Græco, ita elimavit omnia interpretando, atque purgavit, ut nihil in illis, quod a fide nostra discrepet, Latinus lector inveniat. *Hieron. adv. Rufin. lib. I. ed. Martian. T. IV. P. II. p.* 355, concerning this translation of Rufinus: Quum — contulissem cum Græco, illico animadverti, quæ Origenes de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto impie dixerat, et quæ Romanæ aures ferre non poterant, in meliorem partem ab interprete commutata. Cætera autem dogmata, de angelorum ruina, de animarum lapsu, de resurrectionis præstigiis, de mundo vel intermundiis Epicuri, de restitutione omnium in æqualem statum, et multo his deteriora, quæ longum esset retexere, vel ita vertisse, ut in Græco invenerat, vel de commentariolis Didymi, qui Origenis apertissimus propugnator est, exaggerata et firmiora posuisse. *Ejusd. Epist.* 94 *ad Avitum:* Quæ insania est, paucis de Filio et Spiritu Sancto commutatis, quæ apertam blasphemiam præferebant, cætera ita ut scripta sunt protulisse in medium! Concerning his own and the earlier translations, *Ejusdem Epist.* 41 *ad Pammach. et Oceanum:* Ego omnia, quæ vitiata fuerunt, correxi. — Nec disertiores sumus Hilario, nec fideliores Victorino, qui ejus tractatus, non ut interpretes, sed ut auctores proprii operis transtulerunt. Nuper S. Ambrosius sic Hexaëmeron illius compilavit, ut magis Hippolyti sententias Basiliique sequeretur.) — Amongst the writings no longer extant are the στρωματεῖς in 10 Books. — *Philocalia* a Basilio M. et Gregorio Theol. ex variis Origenis Commentariis excerpta, primum græce. ed. *Jo. Tarinus.* Paris. 1618. 4to. — *Orig. opp. omnia ed. Cur. et Car. Vinc. de la Rue.* Paris. 1740 - 59. 4 voll. fol. [Vid. Murdock's Mosheim, I. 204. Milner, Cent. III. cc. 5, 6, 15. — Tr.]

§ 61.

(Continuation). VIEW OF THE ALEXANDRIAN THEOLOGY, PARTICULARLY THAT OF ORIGEN.

Vid. *Guerike*, etc. (§ 60.) pars posterior: De scholæ Alexandrinæ catecheticæ theologia. Halis. 1825.

In the Alexandrian school *Philosophy* was held in high esteem, not only as having been to the Heathen what the Law was to the Jews, a preparation for Christianity, but as the only means of penetrating the hidden spirit of its doctrines (*γνῶσις, γνωστικοί*).[1] This Gnosis was certainly different from that of the heretics (*ψευδώνυμος γνῶσις*), since it took for its foundation the received doctrines of the church (*πίστις*),[2] which had been modified in express opposition to the Gnostics. Still, however, these orthodox Gnostics were led, by the attempt to combine Christianity with general philosophical principles, to some speculations not wholly unlike those of their heretic brethren. Like them too, they believed that their Gnosis had been handed down to them as a mystery,[3] and was only to be communicated

---

1 *Clemens in Strom.* (ed. Potter) I. p. 331: ἐπαιδαγώγει καὶ αὐτὴ (ἡ φιλοσοφία) τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν, ὡς ὁ νόμος τοὺς Ἑβραίους εἰς Χριστόν. p. 337: Θεόθεν ἥκειν εἰς ἀνθρώπους. p. 338: φιλοσοφίαν δὲ οὐ τὴν Στωϊκὴν λέγω, οὐδὲ τὴν Πλατωνικὴν, ἢ τὴν Ἐπικούρειόν τε, καὶ Ἀριστοτελικήν· ἀλλ' ὅσα εἴρηται παρ' ἑκάστῳ τῶν αἱρέσεων τούτων καλῶς, δικαιοσύνην μετὰ εὐσεβοῦς ἐπιστήμης ἐκδιδάσκοντα, τοῦτο σύμπαν τὸ ἐκλεκτικὸν φιλοσοφίαν φημί. Hence his zeal against those who maintained (*Strom.* I. p. 326), πρὸς κακοῦ ἂν τὴν φιλοσοφίαν εἰσδεδυκέναι τὸν βίον, ἐπὶ λύμῃ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, πρός τινος εὑρετοῦ πονηροῦ, namely, (VI. p. 773 and 822) τοῦ διαβόλου. *Origenes in Genesin* hom. 14, § 3: Philosophia neque in omnibus legi Dei contraria est, neque in omnibus consona. — — Moralis et physica, quæ dicitur philosophia, pæne omnia, quæ nostra sunt, sentiunt.

2 *Clem. Strom.* VII. p. 865: ἡ μὲν οὖν πίστις σύντομός ἐστιν, ὡς εἰπεῖν, τῶν κατεπειγόντων γνῶσις· ἡ γνῶσις δὲ ἀπόδειξις τῶν διὰ πίστεως παριληφθέντων ἰσχυρὰ καὶ βέβαιος, διὰ τῆς κυριακῆς διδασκαλίας ἐποικοδομουμένη τῇ πίστει. *Origenes c. Celsum lib.* VI. (ed. Spencer. p. 284): ἡ θεία τοίνυν σοφία, ἑτέρα οὖσα τῆς πίστεως, πρῶτόν ἐστι τῶν καλουμένων χαρισμάτων τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ μετ' ἐκείνην δεύτερον, τοῖς ἀκριβοῦν τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐπισταμένοις, ἡ καλουμένη γνῶσις· καὶ τρίτον (ἐπεὶ σώζεσθαι χρὴ καὶ τοὺς ἁπλουστέρους, προσιόντας κατὰ δύναμιν τῇ θεοσεβείᾳ) ἡ πίστις, its reference to 1 Cor. xii. 8, 9. *De principiis* I. præf. § 3: Illud autem scire oportet, quoniam sancti Apostoli fidem Christi prædicantes de quibusdam quidem, quæcunque necessaria crediderunt, omnibus — manifestissime tradiderunt, rationem scilicet assertionis eorum relinquentes ab his inquirendam, qui Spiritus dona excellentia mererentur, de aliis vero dixerunt quidem, quia sint: quomodo autem, aut unde sint, siluerunt, profecto ut studiosiores quique ex posteris suis, qui amatores essent sapientiæ, exercitium habere possent, in quo ingenii sui fructum ostenderent, hi videlicet qui dignos se et capaces ad recipiendam sapientiam præpararent. Cf. *Neander de fidei Gnoseosque christ. idea secundum mentem Clem. Alex. dissert.* Heidelberg. 1811. 8vo. Kirch. Gesch. I. III. 905 ff.

2 *Clemens Strom.* VI. p. 771: γνωστικὴ παράδοσις. — ἡ γνῶσις δὲ αὐτὴ, ἡ κατὰ διαδοχὰς εἰς ὀλίγους ἐκ τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἀγράφως παραδοθεῖσα κατελήλυθεν. *Idem hypotyp.* VII. (*Euseb. h. e.* II. 1, 2): Ἰακώβῳ τῷ δικαίῳ καὶ Ἰωάννῃ καὶ Πέτρῳ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν παρέδωκε τὴν γνῶσιν ὁ κύριος· οὗτοι τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀποστόλοις παρέδωκαν, οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι τοῖς ἑβδομήκοντα. *Origenes c. Cels.* VI. p. 279: Ἰησοῦς, ὅτι μὲν ἐλάλει τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς κατ' ἰδίαν, καὶ μάλιστα

to the initiated.[4] Origen, indeed, is somewhat more free in speaking of these secret doctrines, but sometimes with evident hesitation, and is very explicit in his warnings, that these things are not to be promiscuously told to the people.[5] Two great principles run through the whole of the Alexandrian theology. The one, that all anthropopathetic (*borrowed from human nature*) notions of God must be carefully avoided, is seen in their constant efforts to purify the doctrines of religion from every thing earthly and material; the other, that man is without any limitation a morally free being, and that the condition of all morally free beings depends entirely on themselves, led to still more striking results.

The most remarkable of their doctrines are the following:

1. That the Godhead can never be unemployed: so that an endless series of worlds preceded the present, and an endless series of worlds will follow it.[6]

2. That all intellectual beings (angels, stars, men, demons) were originally created alike, and none of them without a body, as this is the peculiar attribute of the Deity. Some of them having sinned, God created the world and banished the fallen spirits into bodies, more or less gross, according to the degree of their sinfulness.[7] Still they all retain their moral freedom, and are able, if they will, to rise again from their degraded state. Even the punishments of the damned are not eternal, but only remedial; whilst the Devil himself may reform and be pardoned.[8] When the world shall have answered the purpose

---

ἐν ταῖς ἀναχωρήσεσιν, εἴρηται· τίνα δ' ἦν, ἃ ἔλεγεν, οὐκ ἀναγέγραπται. οὐ γὰρ ἐφαίνετο αὐτοῖς γραπτέα ἱκανῶς εἶναι ταῦτα πρὸς τοὺς πολλοὺς, οὐδὲ ῥητά.

4 *Clem. Strom.* I. p. 324: τὰ μὲν ἑκὼν παραπέμπομαι, ἐκλέγων ἐπιστημόνως, φοβούμενος γεράφειν, ἃ καὶ λέγειν ἐφυλαξάμην· οὔ τί που φθονῶν, οὐ γὰρ θέμις, δεδιὼς δὲ ἄρα περὶ τῶν ἐντυγχανόντων, μή πῃ ἑτέρως σφαλεῖεν, καὶ παιδὶ μάχαιραν, ἤ φασιν οἱ παραιμιαζόμενοι, δόντες εὐρεθῶμεν.

5 Thus, for example, that future punishment would not be eternal, *Orig. c. Cels.* III. p. 159; VIII. p. 411. — Speaking of his views de fine vel consummatione, he says, *de princ.* I. 6, § 1: Quæ quidem a nobis etiam cum magno metu et cautela dicuntur, discutientibus magis et pertractantibus quam pro certo ac definito statuentibus, etc.

6 This notion is found still earlier, being contained in the *Hypotyposes* of Clement: ὕλην ἄχρονον — ἔτι δὲ μετεμψυχώσεις καὶ πολλοὺς πρὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ κόσμους περατεύεται (*Phot.* cod. 109). *Origenes de princ.* III. 5, 3. The Stoics had a similar doctrine.

7 *Keil* opp. vol. II. p. 652, maintains that this is also the doctrine of *Clement. Strom.* IV. p. 640. This is denied, however, by *Hostede de Groot* disp. de *Clem. Alex.* p. 60. Hence it would seem, that they interpret the word μετεμψυχώσεις in Photius, (see note 6), differently. Origen, however, teaches this doctrine plainly, *Origenes de princip.* II. 9, § 6. cf. *Keil*, p. 654 seq. — Similar doctrine of *Basilides*, vid. *Neander's Gnost. Systeme*, S. 41, 50 ff.

8 *Orig. de princip.* I. 6, § 2: Hi vero, qui de statu primæ beatitudinis moti quidem sunt, non tamen irremediabiliter moti, illis, quos supra descripsimus, sanctis beatisque ordinibus dispensandi subjecti sunt ac regendi: quorum adjutorio usi, et institutionibus ac disciplinis salutaribus reformati, redire ac restitui ad statum suæ beatitudinis possint. — § 3: Ex quo, ut opinor, hoc consequentia ipsa videtur ostendere, unamquamque rationabilem naturam posse ab uno in alterum ordinem transeuntem per singulos in omnes, et ab omnibus in singulos pervenire, dum accessus profectuum defectuumve varios pro motibus vel conatibus propriis unusquisque pro liberi arbitrii facultate perpetitur.

for which it was created, as the dwelling-place of fallen spirits, it will be destroyed by fire; and by this fire the soul will be purified from all the stains it may have contracted by its intimate union with the body.[9] But, as spirits always retain their freedom, they may sin again; in which case a new world will be created for them.

3. The Alexandrians speak of the Logos[10] as a highly exalted being, though their expressions are not always distinct. Evidently, however, they make him inferior to the Supreme God.[11] The wish to remove every thing, that could be unworthy of God, from the notion of the generation of the Son, led at last to the doctrine taught by

---

9 *Clemens Strom.* VII. c. 6 *in fine* p. 851. *Origenes in Exod.* xv. 5, (*hom.* VI. *in Exod. ed. de la Rue*, T. II. p. 148): Idcirco igitur qui salvus fit, per ignem salvus fit, ut si quid forte de specie plumbi habuerit admixtum, id ignis decoquat, et resolvat, ut efficiantur omnes aurum bonum. — Veniendum est ergo omnibus ad ignem, veniendum est ad conflatorium. *Sedet enim Dominus, et conflat, et purgat filios Juda.* (*Mal.* iii. 3). Sed et illuc cum venitur, si quis multa opera bona, et parum aliquid iniquitatis attulerit, illud parum tanquam plumbum igni resolvitur ac purgatur, et totum remanet aurum purum. Et si quis plus illuc plumbi detulerit, plus exuritur, ut amplius decoquatur, ut etsi parum aliquid sit auri, purgatum tamen resideat. Quod si aliquis illuc totus plumbeus venerit, fiet de illo hoc quod scriptum est, demergetur in profundum, tanquam plumbum in aquam validissimam. *Homil.* XIV. *in Lucam* (T. III. p. 948): Ego puto, quod et post resurrectionem ex mortuis indigeamus sacramento eluente nos atque purgante: nemo enim absque sordibus resurgere poterit. *c. Celsum* V. p. 240 seq., against Celsus, who derided the notion of a general conflagration: *οὐ συνιδὼν, ὅτι, ὥσπερ Ἑλλήνων τισὶν ἔδοξε (τάχα παρὰ τοῦ ἀρχαιοτάτου Ἕθνους Ἑβραίων λαβοῦσι), τὸ πῦρ καθάρσιον ἐπάγεται τῷ κόσμῳ· εἰκὸς δ' ὅτι καὶ ἑκάστῳ τῶν δεομένων τῆς διὰ τοῦ πυρὸς δίκης ἅμα καὶ ἰατρείας.*

10 Comp. with reference to *Clement Alex.* Martini Gesch. d. Dogma. v. d. Gottheit Christi, S. 74 ff. *Guerike* de scholæ Alex. theologia, p. 131 seq.: with reference to *Origen*, Martini, S. 151 ff. *Guerike*, 197 seq. Schleiermacher in his theolog. Zeitschrift, Heft. 3. S. 342 ff.

11 *Clem. Strom.* VII. p. 831: *τελειωτάτη δὴ καὶ ἀγιωτάτη, καὶ κυριωτάτη, καὶ ἡγεμονικωτάτη, καὶ βασιλικωτάτη, καὶ εὐεργετικωτάτη ἡ υἱοῦ φύσις, ἡ τῷ μόνῳ παντοκράτορι προσεικοτάτη.* — *Origenes comm. in Johannem*, Tom. II. (*ed. de la Rue*, T. IV. p. 50): *τίθησι (Ἰωάννης) τὸ ἄρρητον, ὅτι ἡ θεὸς ὀνομασία ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀγεννήτου φάσκεται τῶν ὅλων αἰτίου, σιωπῇ δὲ αὐτὸ, ὅτε ὁ λόγος θεὸς ὀνομάζεται.* — *αὐτόθεος (ἀληθινὸς θεὸς) ὁ θεός ἐστι, διόπερ καὶ ὁ σωτὴρ φησιν ἐν τῇ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα εὐχῇ, ἵνα γινώσκωσί σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν* (John xvii. 3). *πᾶν δὲ τὸ παρὰ τὸ αὐτόθεος μετοχῇ τῆς ἐκείνου θεότητος θεοποιούμενον, οὐχ' ὁ θεὸς ἀλλὰ θεὸς κυριώτερον ἂν λέγοιτο· ᾧ πάντως ὁ πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, ἅτε τρῶτος τῷ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εἶναι, στάσας τῆς θεότητος εἰς ἑαυτόν, ἐστι τιμιώτερος τοῖς λοιτοῖς παρ' αὐτὸν θεοῖς κ. τ. λ.* p. 60: *εἰ πάντα διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐγένετο, οὐχ ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου ἐγένετο, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ κρείττονος καὶ μείζονος παρὰ τὸν λόγον. c. Cels.* VIII. p. 387: *ἔστω δὴ, τιν ἀς — διὰ τὴ προπίτειαν ὑποτίθεσθαι τὸν Σωτῆρα εἶναι τὸν ἐπὶ πάσι θεόν. ἀλλ' οὔσιγε ἡμεῖς τοιούτον, οἱ τιθέμενοι αὐτῷ λέγοντι, ὁ πατὴρ, ὁ πέμψας με, μείζων μου ἐστί* (John xiv. 28), hence he is called, lib. V. p. 258, *δεύτερος θεός. Comm. in Joh.* p. 235: *τὸν σωτῆρα, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὑπερεχόμενον τοσοῦτον ἢ καὶ πλέον ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς, ὅσῳ ὑπερέχει αὐτὸς καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα τῶν λοιπῶν.* — *ὁ υἱὸς οὐ συγκρίνεται κατ' οὐδὲν τῷ πατρί. De princ.* I. 2, 13: *Οὕτω τοίνυν ἡγοῦμαι καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος καλῶς ἂν ληχθήσεσθαι, ὅτι εἰκὼν ἀγαθότητος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν, ἀλλ' οὐκ αὐτοαγαθόν. καὶ τάχα καὶ υἱὸς ἀγαθὸς, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἁπλῶς ἀγαθός. καὶ ὥσπερ εἰκὼν ἐστι τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο θεὸς, ἀλλ' οὐ περὶ οὗ λέγει αὐτὸς ὁ Χριστὸς "ἵνα γινώσκωσί σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν." οὕτως εἰκὼν ἀγαθότητος, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ἀταραλλάκτως ἀγαθός.*

Origin, that the Logos did not proceed from the essence of the Father,[12] but was produced by the will of God,[13] generated from all eternity.[14] He taught also, that the Holy Ghost was created by the Son.[15]

---

12 *Origenes comm. in Joh.* p. 306: Ἄλλοι δὲ τὸ, ἐξῆλθον ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, διηγήσαντο ἀντὶ τοῦ, γεγέννημαι ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, οἷς ἀκολουθεῖ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας φύσκειν τοῦ πατρὸς γεγεννῆσθαι τὸν υἱὸν, οἱονεὶ μεισυμένου, καὶ λείποντος τῇ οὐσίᾳ, ἢ πρότερον εἶχε. — ἀκολουθεῖ δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ σῶμα λέγειν τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν, καὶ διηρῆσθαι τὸν πατέρα, ἀπέῳ ἐστι δόγματα ἀνθρώπων, μηδ' ὄναρ φύσιν ἄῤῥατον καὶ ἀσώματον πεφανταασμένων, οὖσαν κυρίως οὐσίαν, κ. τ. λ. cf. *De princ.* I. 2, 6, and IV. 28.

13 *Orig. de princ.* I. 2, 6: Filius utique natus ex patre est, velut quædam voluntas ejus ex mente procedens. Et ideo ego arbitror, quod sufficere debeat voluntas patris ad subsistendum hoc quod vult pater. Volens enim non alia via utitur, nisi quæ consilio voluntatis profertur. Ita ergo et filio subsistentia generatur ab eo. *Idem in Justiniani epist. ad Menam* (*Mansi collect. concill.* IX. p. 523): οὗτος δὲ ὁ υἱὸς ἐκ θελήματος τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθείς. Hence, in speaking of the creation of the Son, they used the expressions ποιεῖν, κτίζειν. As to *Clement*, see *Photius* cod. 109: τὸν υἱὸν εἰς κτίσμα κατάγει (namely, in the Hypotyposes). *Rufinus*, also, *de adulterat. libb. Origenis*, grants: Interdum invenimus aliqua in libris ejus (Clementis) capitula, in quibus filium Dei creaturam dicit: although he chooses to consider these passages as spurious. *Clemens Strom.* V. p. 699: ἡ σοφία ἡ πρωτόκτιστος τῷ Θεῷ. So also *Origen. Comm. in Joh.* Tom. 1. (*ed. de la Rue*, T. IV. p. 21): κτίσις — ἔμψυχον σοφίαν ὁ Θεός. *contra Celsum*, V. p. 257, calls the Son πρέσβυτατον πάντων τῶν δημιουργημάτων. *Justinian*, l. c. accuses Origen of calling the Son κτίσμα, *de princip. lib.* IV. These expressions, however, must still have been in general use, since *Prov.* viii. 22: Κύριος ἔκτισέ με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ, was considered a chief passage on the subject of the Logos. Münter's Dogmengesch. Bd. I. S. 445.

14 *Origenes in Genesin* (*Eusebius contra Marcellum*, I. c. 4, in *de la Rue*, II. p. 1): Οὐ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς πατὴρ εἶναι ἠέζατο, κωλυόμενος, ὡς οἱ γενόμενοι πατέρες ἄνθρωποι, ὑπὸ τοῦ μὴ δύνασθαί πω πατέρες εἶναι. Εἰ γὰρ ἀεὶ τέλειος ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ πάρεστιν αὐτῷ δύναμις τοῦ πατέρα αὐτὸν εἶναι, καὶ καλὸν, αὐτὸν εἶναι πατέρα τοῦ τοιούτου υἱοῦ· τί ἀναβάλλεται, καὶ ἑαυτὸν τοῦ καλοῦ στηρίτκει, καὶ ὡς ἔστιν εἰπεῖν, ἐξ οὗ δύναται πατὴρ εἶναι υἱοῦ. Τὸ αὐτὸ μέντοιγε καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος λεκτέον. (On like grounds, however, Origen is said by Methodius, ap. Photium, cod. 235, to have maintained συνεῖδιον εἶναι τῷ — Θεῷ τὸ σῶν.) Comp. *De princ.* I. 2, 2; IV. 28. Nearly related to this passage is the fragment of Origen, *Athanasius de decretis Nic. Syn.* c. 27. — ὁμοιότης τυγχάνων τοῦ πατρὸς (ὁ υἱὸς) οὐκ ἔστιν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν. Πότε γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς — ἀπαύγασμα οὐκ εἶχε τῆς ἰδίας δόξης, ἵνα τολμήσας τις ἀρχὴν δῷ εἶναι υἱοῦ πρότερον οὐκ ὄντος; — κατανοείτω γὰρ ὁ τολμῶν καὶ λέγων "ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν ὁ υἱὸς" ὅτι ἐρεῖ καὶ τό· σοφία ποτὲ οὐκ ἦν, καὶ λόγος οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ζωὴ οὐκ ἦν. *Orig. comm. in Joh.* p. 33: τό· υἱός μου εἶ σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε, λέγεται πρὸς αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ᾧ ἀεί ἐστι τὸ σήμερον. — ὁ συμπαρεκτείνων τῇ ἀγεννήτῳ καὶ ἀΐδίῳ αὐτοῦ ζωῇ — χρόνος ἡμέρα ἐστὶν αὐτῷ σήμερον, ἐν ᾗ γεγέννηται ὁ υἱός. *In Jeremiam hom.* IX. (T. III. p. 181): οὐχὶ ἐγέννησεν ὁ πατὴρ τὸν υἱὸν, καὶ ἀπέλυσεν αὐτὸν ὁ πατὴρ ἀπὸ τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἀεὶ γεννᾷ αὐτόν.

15 *Origenes in Johann.* I, 3 (*de la Rue*, IV. p. 605): οἶμαι γὰρ ὅτι τῷ μὲν φάσκοντι γεννητὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον εἶναι, καὶ προϊεμένῳ τὸ "πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο," ἀναγκαῖον παραδέξασθαι, ὅτι τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐγένετο, πρεσβυτέρου παρ' αὐτὸ τοῦ λόγου συγχάνοντος. — Ἡμεῖς μέντοιγε τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις πειθόμενοι τυγχάνειν, τὸν πατέρα, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, καὶ ἀγέννητον μηδὲν ἕτερον τοῦ πατρὸς εἶναι πιστεύοντες, ὡς εὐσεβέστερον καὶ ἀληθὲς, προσιέμεθα τὸ, πάντων διὰ τοῦ λόγου γινομένων τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα πάντων εἶναι τιμιώτερον, καὶ τάξει πάντων [fort. πρώτων] τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς διὰ χριστοῦ γεγενημένων. Καὶ τάχα αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ αἰτία τοῦ μὴ καὶ αὐτὸ υἱὸν χρηματίζειν τοῦ Θεοῦ, μόνου τοῦ μονογενοῦς φύσει υἱοῦ ἀρχῆθεν τυγχάνοντος, οὗ χρῆζειν ἔοικε τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, διακονοῦντος αὐτοῦ τῇ ὑποστάσει, οὐ

4. The body assumed by the Logos, when it became man, was not of flesh, but of a nobler texture. According to Origen, it united itself not with a human body, but a human soul.[16]

5. The Alexandrians must of course have been averse to the doctrine of Chiliasm, which, as then held, was so contrary to their anti-materialism. Clement does not allude to it. Origen, however, opposes it openly, giving to the passages, which were thought to favor the doctrine, an allegorical interpretation.[17]

6. The doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh was, with many Christians, founded on such exaggerated notions of the relative importance of the body in man, that some of them (the Arabians) actually held the soul as an accident, or quality, of the body.[18] With the Alexandrians, on the other hand, to whom the body was only the prison-house of the spirit, it was a natural and consistent doctrine, that the soul would not resume its material body, but one of an incorruptible and far more glorious texture.[19]

To prove this system from the Scriptures, the Alexandrians availed themselves of the allegorical method of interpretation, which had long been in use. In this way the interpretation of the Scriptures had become a mere play of the fancy, till Origen introduced something

---

μόνον εἰς τὸ εἶναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ σοφὸν εἶναι, καὶ λογικόν, περὶ δίκαιον, κ. τ. λ. *De princ.* I. 3, 5: μείζων ἡ δύναμις τοῦ πατρὸς παρὰ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. πλείων δὲ ἡ τοῦ υἱοῦ παρὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ πάλιν διαφέρουσα μᾶλλον τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἡ δύναμις παρὰ τὰ ἄλλα ἅγια.

16 *Clem. Coh. ad Græc.* p. 86: τὸ ἀνθρώπου προσωπεῖον ἀναλαβῶν καὶ σαρκὶ ἀναπλασάμενος τὸ σωτήριον δρᾶμα τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος ὑπεκρίνατο. *Orig. c. Cels.* IV. § 15, 19. *Photius cod.* 109, accuses Clement (though no doubt in this he goes too far) of teaching, μὴ σαρκωθῆναι τὸν λόγον, ἀλλὰ δόξαι. cf. *Guerike*, l. c. p. 145, 240. *De Princip.* II. 6, § 3: Hac ergo substantia animæ inter Deum carnemque mediante (non enim possibile erat Dei naturam corpori sine mediatore misceri) nascitur Deus homo, illa substantia media existente, cui utique contra naturam non erat corpus assumere.

17 Comp. the view of Chiliasm in the *excerptis ex scriptis Theodoti* (Clem. opp. vol. II. p. 1004): οἱ γὰρ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων εἰς ἀγγέλους μεταστάντες χίλια ἔτη μαθητεύονται ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων, κ. τ. λ. *Orig. de princip.* II. 11, § 6: Puto enim, quod sancti quique discedentes de hac vita permanebunt in loco aliquo in terra posito, quem paradisum dicit scriptura divina, velut in quodam eruditionis loco, et, ut ita dixerim, auditorio vel schola animarum, etc. On the other hand, *ibid.* § 2: Quidam ergo laborem quodammodo intelligentiæ recusantes, et superficiem quandam legis literæ consectantes, et magis delectationi suæ quodammodo ac libidini indulgentes, solius literæ discipuli, arbitrantur repromissiones futuras in voluptate et luxuria corporis exspectandas: et propterea præcipue carnes iterum desiderant post resurrectionem tales, quibus manducandi, et bibendi, et omnia quæ carnis et sanguinis sunt agendi nunquam desit facultas, apostoli Pauli de resurrectione spiritalis corporis sententiam non sequentes. Cf. *Proleg. in Cant. Cant. etc.*

18 *Euseb.* h. e. VI. 37: ἔλεγον, τὴν ἀνθρωπείαν ψυχὴν τέως μὲν κατὰ τὸν ἐνεστῶτα καιρὸν ἅμα τῇ τελευτῇ συναποθνήσκειν τοῖς σώμασι καὶ συνδιαφθείρεσθαι· αὖθις δέ ποτὲ κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἀναστάσεως καιρὸν σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀναβιώσεσθαι. Neander supposes this to have been borrowed from the Gnostics, gnost. Systeme, S. 217. Ann. 16. — The name *Arabici* first occurs in Augustin. de hæres. c. 83.

19 *Clemens* Pædag. II. p. 230: αὐτῇ καθαρᾷ τῇ σαρκὶ ἐπενδυσάμενοι τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν. *Orig. de princ.* II. 10, 3, &c. 11, (see note 17). cf. *Guerike*, l. c. p. 285 seq.

better. By distinguishing accurately between the *verbal*, the *moral*, and the *mystic* sense of Scripture, he reinstated grammatical interpretation in its rights,[20] and in his own commentaries furnished a rich treasure for its study, having thus become the chief source for all succeeding commentators.

§ 62.

(Continuation.) FOLLOWERS AND OPPOSERS OF ORIGEN.

Even in the lifetime of Origen his peculiar opinions were quite as often opposed as approved;[1] so that he found it necessary by a public confession of faith to attempt to remove the unfavorable impressions made, not so much by his theology, as by the exaggerations and misrepresentations of common report.[2] After his death, however, his scholars had still more frequent occasion to defend him and his doctrines. To the more distinguished amongst them, *Dionysius* (from A. D. 233 at the head of the school, from A. D. 248 bishop of Alexandria, † A. D. 265)[3] belongs the merit of having completely put down the belief in the Millennium, which his master had attacked. This was on occasion of a dispute with an Egyptian bishop, Nepos, who, in a work called ἔλεγχος Ἀλληγοριστῶν, insisted particularly on the literal interpretation of the Apocalypse, and the description of the Millennium therein contained. Owing, no doubt, to the persecution by Decius, this view was extensively adopted by the oppressed Christians, to whom it furnished strong motives of endurance. But this having ceased, Dionysius succeeded by personal argument and his

---

20 First principle of his criticism, *Homil. V. in Levit.* § 5: Triplicem in scripturis divinis intelligentiæ inveniri sæpe diximus modum, historicum, moralem et mysticum. Unde et corpus inesse ei et animam et spiritum intelleximus. Comp. Valentinus, above, § 43). His critical principles are given most fully de Princip. lib. IV. — The opinion of Porphyry concerning his allegories, *Eusebius* h. e. VI. 19, 2, 3. Amongst others: ἠχρῆτο δὲ καὶ Χαιρήμονος τοῦ Στωϊκοῦ, Κορνοούτου τε ποῖς βίβλοις· παρ' ὧν τὸν μεταληπτικὸν τῶν παρ' Ἕλλησι μυστηρίων γνοὺς τρόπον, ταῖς Ἰουδαϊκαῖς προσήψε γραφαῖς. Comp. *Mosheim* comm. de rebus Christ. ante Const. M. p. 629 - 658. — *J. A. Ernesti* de Origene interpretationis librorum SS. grammaticæ auctore (opusc. philol. et crit. Lugd. Bat. 1764. p. 288 seq.) *C. R. Hagenbach* observatt. circa Origenis methodum interpretandæ sacræ scripturæ. Basil. 1823. 8vo.

1 *Origenes hom. XXV. in Lucam*: Plerique dum plus diligunt quam meremur, hæc jactant et loquuntur, sermones nostros doctrinamque laudantes, quæ conscientia nostra non recipit. Alii vero tractatus nostros calumniantes, ea sentire nos criminantur, quæ nunquam sensisse nos novimus. Sed neque hi qui plus diligunt, neque illi qui oderunt, veritatis regulam tenent, et alii per dilectionem, alii per odium metiuntur.

2 *Euseb.* h. e. VI. 36: γράφει δὲ καὶ Φαβιανῷ, τῷ κατὰ Ῥώμην ἐπισκόπῳ, ἑτέροις τε πλείστοις ἄρχουσιν ἐκκλησιῶν, περὶ τῆς κατ' αὐτὸν ὀρθοδοξίας. Hieron. Ep. 41.

3 The fragments of his writings are collected by *Gallandius* Bibl. PP. T. III. p. 481 seq. *Simon de Magistris.* Romæ. 1796. fol. [See Murdock's Mosheim, I. 208. — Tr.]

work περὶ ἐπαγγελιῶν, not only in convincing of their error those who held this belief, but in extirpating the doctrine of Chiliasm from the Eastern church.[4] In his controversy with Sabellius, he was less fortunate. For in opposing his antagonist's doctrine concerning the Trinity, he was led to develope more distinctly the hitherto indefinite distinctions of his school, and to say too plainly that the Son was only a creature of the Father.[5] Being reproved for this by Dionysius, bishop of Rome, he could only save himself from the charge of heresy by untenable excuses.[6] We find this same assertion concerning the creation of the Son, made afterwards, however, by *Theognostus*, another follower of Origen;[7] and, as it would seem, by Gregory,[8] known by the name of Thaumaturgus, (A. D. 244 bishop of New Cesarea, † about A. D. 270), in his controversy with Paul of Samosata.[9] It is highly probable also, that Hierax of Leontopolis, who

---

4 *Euseb.* h. e. VII. 24, 25. Dionysius supposed the Apocalypse to have been written by another John, and not the Apostle. *Mynster* diss. de Dionysii Alex. circa Apoc. Joann. sententia, hujusque vi in seriorem libri æstimationem. Hafn. 1826.

5 This is omitted by Euseb. VII. 26. But we have *Athanasii* περὶ Διονυσίου τοῦ Επ. Αλ. liber. In the letter of *Dionysius* to *Ammon*, bishop of Berenice, and *Euphranor*, he says, Athanas. l. c. cap. 4: ποίημα καὶ γενητὸν εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ· μήτε δὲ φύσει ἴδιον, ἀλλὰ ξένον κατ' οὐσίαν εἶναι τοῦ πατρός· ὥσπερ ἐστὶν ὁ γεωργὸς πρὸς τὴν ἄμπελον, καὶ ὁ ναυπηγὸς πρὸς τὸ σκάφος· καὶ γὰρ ὡς ποίημα ὤν, οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γένηται. Cap. 14, the Arians attributed to him also the following assertions: οὐκ ἀεὶ ἦν ὁ Θεὸς πατήρ, οὐκ ἀεὶ ἦν ὁ υἱός· — ἀλλ' ἦν ποτὲ ὅτε οὐκ ἦν. comp. Martini Gesch. d. Dogma v. d. Gottheit Christi, S. 198 ff. Schleiermacher in his Zeitschrift, Heft 3. S. 402 ff.

6 Fragments of his Ἔλεγχος καὶ Ἀπολογία, libb. IV., preserved in Athanasius and Basilius, are collected by *Coustant* in his Epistt. Rom. Pontif. *Gallandius.* T. III. p. 495. *Routh reliqu. sacr.* vol. III. p. 194 seq. (where, however, in the 2d Fragm. of the first book the variation in the text from Euthym. Zigab. Panoplia in *Gallandius.* T. XIV. App. p. 118, is to be compared.) Dionysius declares here, lib. I.: οὐ γὰρ ἦν ὅτε ὁ Θεὸς οὐκ ἦν πατήρ. Then he asserts that it is a fabrication of his opponents that he ever denied τὸν Χριστὸν ὁμοούσιον εἶναι τῷ Θεῷ. εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦτό φημι μὴ εὑρηκέναι, μηδ' ἀνεγνωκέναι που τῶν ἁγίων γραφῶν, ἄλλα γε τὰ ἐπιχειρήματά μου τὰ ἐξῆς ἃ σεσιωπήκασι, τῆς διανοίας ταύτης οὐκ ἀπᾴδει. Martini, l. c. S. 203 ff.

7 *Photii* bibl. cod. 106. In his *Hypotyposes*, υἱὸν δὲ λέγων, κτίσμα αὐτὸν ἀποφαίνει, καὶ τῶν λογικῶν μόνον ἐπιστατεῖν. Still he appears according to the fragment in *Athanasius de decretis Syn. Nicænæ*, c. 25, to have had the same notions of the logos as the Platonizing teachers in the church: οὐκ ἐξωθέν τίς ἐστιν ἐφυεθείσα ἡ τοῦ υἱοῦ οὐσία, οὐδὲ ἐκ μὴ ὄντων ἐπεισήχθη· ἀλλὰ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας ἔφυ, ὡς τοῦ φωτὸς τὸ ἀπαύγασμα, ὡς ὕδατος ἀτμίς· — ἀπόῤῥοια τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας, οὐ μερισμὸν ὑπομεινάσης τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας.

8 *Basilii M.* epist. 210 (al. 64) § 5: (Sabelliani) καθήκαν δὶ τινα πεῖραν δι' ἐπιστολῆς, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ὁμόψυχον ἡμῶν Ἄνθιμον τὸν Τυάνων ἐπίσκοπον, ὡς ἄρα Γρηγορίου εἰπόντος ἐν ἐκθέσει πίστεως, πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν ἐπινοίᾳ μὲν εἶναι δύο, ὑποστάσει δὲ ἕν. τοῦτο δὲ, ὅτι οὐ δογματικῶς εἴρηται, ἀλλ' ἀγωνιστικῶς ἐν τῇ πρὸς Αἰλιανὸν διαλέξει, οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν συνιδεῖν. On the other hand: διὸ δὴ καὶ πολλὰς ἂν εὕροις ἐκεῖ φωνὰς, τὰς νῦν τοῖς αἱρετικοῖς μεγίστην ἰσχὺν παρεχόμενας, ὡς τὸ κτίσμα, καὶ τὸ ποίημα, καὶ εἴ τι τοιοῦτον. Martini, l. c. S. 233 ff.

9 Writings: εἰς Ὠριγένην προσφωνητικὸς καὶ πανηγυρικὸς λόγος — ἐπιστολὴ κανονική — (The ἔκθεσις τῆς πίστεως is not genuine, vid. Martini, l. c. S. 231. cf. *Walchii*

lived towards the end of this century, was of Origen's school; his allegorical interpretation, his rejection of the resurrection of the body, and of all sensual notions of a future life, as also his condemnation of marriage and of the use of meat and wine, resembling much more the doctrines of Origen than those of the Manichæans. Epiphanius seems to have been led to this last opinion by a few external points of resemblance.[10] At the end of this period the sentiment concerning Origen was so divided, that his opponents were as violent as his friends were enthusiastic. Amongst the first was Methodius, bishop of Olympus (or Patara) and afterwards of Tyre, (suffered martyrdom A. D. 311). In a work περὶ ἀναστάσεως he defended the doctrine of the resurrection of the body; and in another work περὶ τῶν γενητῶν he attacked the notion of an endless succession of worlds.[11] On the other hand, Origen found a zealous defender in Pamphilus, presbyter at Cæsarea, (martyred in the year 309), who wrote in prison an apology for Origen, in 5 books, to which Eusebius Pamphili added a sixth. From the first book, which is still preserved, we may see how report had misrepresented the opinions of Origen, and thus aroused the blind hate of the multitude against him.[12] In Alexandria, Origen

---

bibl. Symbol. vetus, p. 14 seq. 20 seq.) His life by *Gregory Nyssen.* Opp. omnia una cum vita ed. *G. Vossius.* Mogunt. 1604. 4to. [Murdock's Mosheim, I. 207. — Tr.]

10 Only authority *Epiphan. hær.* 67. *Mosheim de rebus Christ. ante Const.* p. 903 seq.

11 Fragments in *Epiphan. hær.* 64. *Photii bibl. cod.* 234, 235. In a later work called Ξένων, he is said to have changed, and become the enthusiastic admirer of Origen, (Socrat. h. e. VI. 13). Other works: περὶ αὐτεξουσίου, Symposion decem virginum etc. Opp. ed. *Fr. Combefisius.* Paris. 1644. fol. [Murdock's Mosheim, I. 210. — Tr.]

12 *Pamphilus* is said to have had a large library at Cæsarea. — In connexion with Eusebius he undertook the Hexaplar edition of the Septuagint. — The first book only of his Apologia pro Origene is extant, in a Latin translation by Rufinus (in opp. Origenis). Fragm. in Photius cod. 118. — From the *Præfatio ad Confessores ad metalla Palæstinæ damnatos:* Nihil mirum, fratres, videmini mihi esse perpessi, quod ita vos Origenis subterfugit intellectus, ut vos quoque ea æstimetis de illo, quæ et alii nonnulli: qui sive per imperitiam sui, qua non valent sensus ejus altitudinem contueri, sive pravitate mentis, qua studium gerunt non solum dicta ejus incusare, verum etiam adversus eos, qui hæc legunt, hostiles inimicitias sumere, tam pertinaciter id agentes, ut nulla prorsus venia eos dignos haberi putent, ne ea quidem, quam impertire solent, verbi gratia, his qui vel Græcorum sæcularium libros, vel nonnunquam etiam hæreticorum, percunctandi atque agnoscendi studio decurrunt. — Miramur in tantum temeritatis aliquos esse provectos, ut, qui se ita humilitate judicat, adstruant, quod ab aliis dicta ejus vel libri pro sermonibus Apostolicis vel dictis Propheticis habeantur, aut quod ille ipse vel Prophetis vel Apostolis ab aliquo comparetur. — Multos invenias, quos si interroges, in quibus libris aut in quibus locis dicta sint hæc, quæ arguunt, confitentur, se quidem nescire ea, de quibus affirmant, nec legisse unquam, audisse autem alios dicentes. — The aspersions which Pamphilus shows to be false are these: *Prima* illa est, quod ajunt, eum innatum dicere filium Dei. *Secunda,* quod dicunt per prolationem, secundum Valentini fabulas, in subsistentiam venisse Filium Dei dicere. *Tertia,* quæ his omnibus valde contraria est, quod dicunt eum, secundum Arteman vel Paulum Samosatenum, purum hominem, id est, non etiam Deum dicere Christum Filium Dei. *Post* (IV) ista est, quæ istis omnibus adversatur (cæca enim

had still many followers, though the bishop, Petrus Martyr († A. D. 311), was, perhaps, on the other side.[13]

§ 63.

OTHER DISTINGUISHED TEACHERS OF THE EASTERN CHURCH.

Whilst at Alexandria the interpretation of Scripture was made to subserve the purposes of speculation, we find in Syria and the neighbouring provinces the first traces of that more independent *historico-grammatical* mode of interpretation, for which the East became afterwards so distinguished.[1] Of their writers the following only are known to us, and these very imperfectly: *Julius Africanus* of Nicopolis (Emmaus), probably a presbyter († about A. D. 232), a friend of Origen (though his senior in years), and the earliest writer on chronology;[2] and two presbyters of Antioch, *Dorotheus* (about the year 290),[3] and *Lucian*, who suffered martyrdom in Nicomedia (311).[4] The last has often been considered as the father of Arian-

---

est malitia), quod dicunt eum dicere, δοκήσει i. e. putative tantum et per allegoriam, non etiam secundum ea quæ per historiam referuntur, gesta esse omnia, quæ a Salvatore gesta sunt. *Alia* (V) quoque criminatio est, qua asserunt, eum duos Christos prædicare. *Addunt* (VI) illud quoque, quod historias corporales, quæ per omnem S. Scripturam referuntur de gestis Sanctorum, penitus deneget. *Sed et* (VII) de resurrectione mortuorum, et de impiorum pœnis non levi impugnant eum calumnia, velut negantem peccatoribus inferenda esse supplicia. *Quidam vero* (VIII) disputationes ejus vel opiniones, quas de animæ statu vel dispensatione disseruit, culpant. *Ultima vero omnium* (IX) est criminatio illa, quæ cum omni infamatione dispergitur, μετενσωματώσεως, i. e. quod humanas animas in muta animalia, vel serpentes vel pecudes asserat transmutari post mortem, et quod etiam ipsæ mutorum animalium animæ rationabiles sint.

13 Comp. the fragments in Justiniani epist. ad Menam. (*Mansi* IX. p. 504). Also, Walch's Ketzerhistorie, Th. 7. S. 413. — We have still 15 Canons from a work entitled λόγος περὶ μετανοίας. Other fragments in *Gallandii bibl. Patr.* T. IV. p. 91 seq.

1 Vid. Munter on the Antiochian school in Stäudlins und Tzschirners Archiv. f. Kirchengesch. Bd. 1. St. 1. S. 1 ff.

2 Χρονογραφῶν πέντε σπουδάσματα, — Ἐπιστολὴ περὶ τῆς κατὰ Σωσάνναν ἱστορίας (together with the answer of Origen annexed to the dial. c. Marcionitas ed. *Wetstein*). — Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Ἀριστείδην (on the Genealogies of Christ in Matthew and Luke, partly preserved in *Euseb.* h. e. I. c. 7; another fragment ex Mss. Vindob. et Coisl. first printed in *Routh reliqu. sacr.* II. p. 114). All these remains in *Routh* l. c. p. 105 seq. Later Oriental writers have also attributed to him a comm. on the Gospels. *Assemanni bibl. Orient.* p. 129, 158.

3 *Euseb.* VII. 32, 1: λόγιος ἄνηρ. — φιλόκαλος δ' οὗτος περὶ τὰ θεῖα γεγονὼς, καὶ τῆς Ἑβραΐων ἐπιμελήθη γλώττης· ὡς καὶ αὐταῖς ταῖς Ἑβραϊκαῖς γραφαῖς ἐπιστημόνως ἐντυγχάνειν. ἣν δ' οὗτος τῶν μάλιστα ἐλευθερίων [παιδειῶν] προπαιδείας τε τῆς καθ' Ἕλληνας οὐκ ἄμοιρος. — § 2. Τούτου [οὗ] μετρίως τὰς γραφὰς ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας διηγουμένου κατηκούσαμεν.

4 *Euseb.* VIII. 13; IX. 6. ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα ἄριστος βίῳ τε ἐγκρατὴς καὶ τοῖς ἱεροῖς μαθήμασι συγκεκροτημένος. *Hieronymus catal. c.* 77; Lucianus, vir disertissimus, Antiochenæ Ecclesiæ presbyter, tantum in Scripturarum studio laboravit, ut usque nunc quædam exemplaria Scripturarum Lucianea nuncupentur. Feruntur ejus de fide libelli, et breves ad nonnullos epistolæ.

ism,[5] because he founded the school at Antioch from which *Arius* and his most distinguished friends went out. Of his critical labors and those of his contemporary *Hesychius*,[6] we have but very imperfect notices.[7]

Here also we may best class that *Hippolytus* (about the year 220), concerning whom there is so much uncertainty.[8]

---

5 *Alexander*, bishop of Alexandria, says of him (about A. D. 320), (in Theodoreti hist. eccl. I. 3), ὃν (Παῦλον τὸν Σαμοσατέα) διαδεξάμενος Λουκιανός, ἀποσυνάγωγος ἔμεινε τριῶν, ἐπισκόπων πολυετεῖς χρόνους. ὧν τῆς ἀσεβείας τὴν τρύγα ἐῤῥοφηκότες. — Ἀρειός τε καὶ Ἀχιλλᾶς κ. τ. λ. — The Eusebians appealed to a confession of faith by Lucian, Sozom. III. 5. — Still he is considered as a holy martyr by Eusebius, Athanasius, Jerome, Chrysostom (see the Panegyric on Lucian, Tom. I. hom. 46), and others, and is so regarded in the Roman church to this day.

6 Probably the Egyptian bishop Hesychius, who, according to Euseb. h. e. VIII. 13, 4, was martyred A. D. 311.

7 *Hieron. adv. Rufin. lib. II.* (*ed. Martian. T. IV. P. II. p.* 425): Alexandria et Ægyptus in Septuaginta suis Hesychium laudat auctorem. Constantinopolis usque ad Antiochiam Luciani Martyris exemplaria probat. Mediæ inter has provinciæ Palæstinos codices legunt, quos ab Origene elaboratos Eusebius et Pamphilus vulgaverunt; totusque orbis hac inter se trifaria varietate compugnat. Comp. Eichhorns Einleit. in das A. T. (4te Aufl. 1823). Bd. I. S. 506 ff. — *Hieron. præf. in IV. Evang. ad Damasum:* De novo nunc loquor Testamento. — Prætermitto eos codices, quos a Luciano et Hesychio nuncupatos, paucorum hominum asserit perversa contentio: quibus utique nec in toto veteri Instrumento post LXX interpretes emendare quid licuit: nec in Novo profuit emendasse, cum multarum gentium linguis Scriptura ante translata doceat, falsa esse, quæ addita sunt. Comp. Hugs Einl. in d. N. T. (3te Aufl. 1826). Th. I. S. 196 ff. 231 ff. [Introd. to the N. T. Lond. 1827. 2 vols. 8vo. — Tr.]

8 Concerning him, *Euseb.* VI. c. 20; concerning his writings, *ibid. c.* 22. *Hieronymus catal. c.* 61. A statue of Hippolytus was dug up in Rome, A. D. 1551, with his canon paschalis and a catalogue of his writings (vid. the ed. of *Fabricius* and *Cave hist. lit. vol.* I. p. 104). Neither *Eusebius* nor *Jerome* know where he was bishop; what later writers have said on the subject they have only conjectured from the passage *Euseb.* VI. c. 20, where certain writers, whose works Eusebius had found in the library at Jerusalem, are named in the following order: Βήρυλλος — . ἐπίσκοπος δ' οὗτος ἦν τῶν κατὰ Βόστραν Ἀράβων· ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ Ἱππόλυτος ἑτέρας που καὶ αὐτὸς τοιαύτας ἐκκλησίας· ἦλθε δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς καὶ Γαΐου — διάλογος, ἐπὶ Ῥώμης κ. τ. λ. In accordance with this the Constantinopolitans, *Germanus* and *Leontius*, suppose him to have been bishop at Rome. *Gelasius*, bishop of Rome, supposes him to have been a Metropolitan of Arabia; still later, *Zonaras* and *Nicephorus* suppose him to have been an Episc. Portus Romani, in addition to which *Photius* (cod. 121) supposes him to have been a pupil of Irenæus: more lately, since *St. Moyne*, some writers have sought to take a middle course, supposing him to have been bishop of Portus Romanus (Aden) in Arabia Felix. Of all these authorities the only ones worthy of notice are, 1. *Hieron. l. c.*, who reckons amongst the writings of Hippolytus: προσμιλίαν de laude Domini Salvatoris, in qua præsente Origene se loqui in Ecclesia significat. (What follows: In hujus æmulationem Ambrosius — cohortatus est Origenem, in scripturas Commentarios scribere, seems to be founded only on the misunderstanding of Euseb. VI. c. 22 to c. 23, ἐξ ἐκείνου scil. χρόνου). 2. The catalogues of his writings. The numerous critical writings (see *Jerome*) denote an Oriental origin: the Ἀπολογία ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγελίου καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως and περὶ χαρισμάτων are evidently directed against the Alogi in Asia Minor (see above, § 46, note 7), or else against the opponents of the Montanists at Rome (see § 57, note 8). For this last supposition speaks the notice of *Ebedjesu* († 1318) in *Assemanni bibl. orient. T. III. P. I.*, that amongst the Chaldeans Hippolyti *capita adv. Cajum* and Apologia pro

II. THEOLOGY IN THE WEST.

§ 64.

After *Tertullian* had led the way in adapting the Latin language to the expression of Christian ideas, it soon came into very general use amongst Christians of the West; though much was still written in Greek, and even by Tertullian himself.[1] But in proportion as the Greek language fell into disuse, the interest in the theology of the Greek church diminished. In consequence the Latin church remained stationary, and the gross material conceptions of the Greek theology, introduced by Tertullian in the second century, were still held fast in the third; — the Latins being too much prejudiced against philosophy,[2] and, from their ignorance of the necessary languages, too unskilled in criticism to go forward of themselves. Thus the characteristics of the Western church at this time are an aversion to all theological speculation,[3] and in doctrine a profound immobility which prevented all improvement, except what was unconsciously brought about by the movements in the Greek church.

Apocalypsi et Evangelio Johannis were in existence. — *Hippolyti opera* (for the most part spurious) *ed. J. A. Fabricius.* Hamb. 1716, 1718. 2 voll. fol.

[1] Concerning *Tertullian*, see § 57. He wrote in Greek: de baptismo (*Tert. de bapt.* c. 15), de spectaculis (*de cor. mil.* c. 6), and de virginibus velandis (*de virg. vel.* c. 1) none of these works are now extant.

[2] Although they had unconsciously imbibed many of the Platonic ideas with the Greek theology of the second century. See *Tertullian's* notions on this point above, § 42, note 1. *De præscr. hæret.* c. 7: Quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolymis? quid Academiæ et Ecclesiæ? quid hæreticis et Christianis? Nostra institutio de porticu Salomonis est: qui et ipse tradiderat, dominum in simplicitate cordis esse quærendum. Viderint, qui stoicum, et platonicum, et dialecticum Christianismum protulerunt. Nobis curiositate opus non est post Christum Jesum, nec inquisitione post Evangelium. Cum credimus, nihil desideramus ultra credere. Hoc enim prius credimus, non esse, quod ultra credere debemus. cf. *De anima lib., Apologet.* c. 46, *De præscript. hæret.* c. 7, *Adv. Marcion.* V. c. 19, *De testimonio animæ*, c. 1.

[3] *Tertull. de præscript.* c. 7, (see preceding note). *Cap.* 9: Unius porro et certi instituti infinita inquisitio non potest esse: quærendum est, donec invenias: et credendum, ubi inveneris: et nihil amplius nisi custodiendum, quod credidisti: dum insuper credis, aliud non esse credendum. *Cap.* 14: Cæterum manente forma ejus (regulæ fidei) in suo ordine, quantum libet quæras et tractes, et omnem libidinem curiositatis effundas, si quid tibi videtur vel ambiguitate pendere, vel obscuritate obumbrari. Est utique frater aliquis doctor, gratia scientiæ donatus: est aliquis inter exercitatos conversatus aliquid tecum, curiosius tamen, quærens: novissime ignorare melius est, ne quod non debeas noris. *Fides*, inquit, *tua te salvum fecit* (*Luc.* xviii. 42): non exercitatio scripturarum. Fides in regula posita est, habens legem et salutem de observatione legis: exercitatio autem in curiositate consistit, habens gloriam solam de peritiæ studio. Cedat curiositas fidei, cedat gloria saluti. Certe aut non obstrepant, aut quiescant. Adversus regulam nihil scire, omnia scire est. Decisive rejection of all secret tradition, *ibid.* c. 22: Solent dicere (hæretici), non omnia Apostolos scisse: eadem agitati dementia, qua rursus convertunt, omnia quidem Apostolos scisse, sed non omnia omnibus tradidisse. In utroque Christum reprehensioni injicientes, qui aut minus instructos, aut parum simplices Apostolos miserit. cf. *cap.* 25 & 26.

Whilst they rejected the peculiar tenets of the Montanists, they still retained the gross conceptions of Christianity, and the high estimation of external observances, by which this sect was distinguished. Hence their strong disposition to extend and develope the science of *Ecclesiastical Law.*

The literature of the Western church began in Africa, and was chiefly enriched by African writers. *M. Minucius Felix*, probably an African, a lawyer at Rome about the year 220, defended Christianity against the Heathen, in a work called *Octavius.*[4] *Thascius Cæcilius Cyprianus* (at first a Rhetorician in Carthage, — converted to Christianity A. D. 245, — bishop of Carthage A. D. 248, — suffered martyrdom A. D. 258), left behind various short works, partly in defence of the Christian religion and partly of an exhortatory character, and a large number of letters, relating chiefly to matters of church government and discipline.[5] We have also a work *de trinitate*,[6] by his contemporary *Novatian*, Presbyter at Rome, and founder of the sect which bears his name, in which he teaches the doctrine as then generally received in the church; and a work of *Commodianus* of Carthage, (about A. D. 270), containing eighty moral precepts in verse),* *Arnobius*, a Rhetorician of Sicca, and originally an opposer of Christianity, wrote a work entitled *disputationes adv. gentes*, in 7 books,[7] about the year 303, in which Platonic Gnostic ideas are strangely mixed up with Christianity.[8] His pupil in rhetoric, *L. Cœlius Lac-*

---

4 See § 48, note 8.

5 Vita et passio Cypriani per *Pontium* ejus diaconum scripta in *Ruinart*, and prefixed to the editions of *Cyprian. Jo. Pearsonii* annales Cyprianici, *Fell's* edition. *Prudentii Marani* vita S. Cypr. *Baluzius's* edition. La vie de St. Cyprien (par *Jacq. Gervaise*). Paris. 1717. 4to. — His writings: in the year 246, Lib. ad Donatum. — 247: De idolorum vanitate. — 248: Testimoniorum ad Quirinum adv. Judæos, libb. 3. De habitu virginum. — 251: De unitate ecclesiæ. De lapsis. — 252: De oratione dominica. De mortalitate. Exhort. ad Martyrium. — 253: Lib. ad Demetrianum. — 254: De opere et eleemosynis. — 255: De bono patientiæ. — 256: De zelo et livore. Besides these, 83 letters. Opp. ed. *Nic. Rigaltius.* Paris. 1648. fol. *Joannes Fell.* Oxon. 1682. (Bremæ. 1690. Amstel. 1700). fol. *Steph. Baluzius.* Paris. 1726. (Venet. 1728). fol.

6 ed. Ed. *Welchmann.* Oxon. 1724. (iter. 1728). 8vo.

* Instructiones ed. *Nic. Rigaltius.* Tulli Leuc. 1650. 4to. Bibl. PP. Lugd. T. XXVII. p. 12. C. S. Schurfleisch. Viteberg. 1705.

7 *Hieron. cat.* 79 in *Chronico* ad ann. XX. imperii Constantini. His work is extant only in a Codex of the royal library at Paris, ed. cum recensione viri celeberrimi (*Cl. Salmasii*) et integris omnium commentariis. Lugd. Bat. 1651. 4to. — recogn. *Jo. Conr. Orellius.* Lips. 1816. P. II. Additamentum. Lips. 1817. 8vo. *P. K. Meyer* de ratione et argumento apologetici Arnobiani. Havniæ. 1815. 8vo.

8 e. g. *Arnobius*, II. c. 15: Nihil est, quod nos fallat, — quod a novis quibusdam dicitur viris, — animas immortales esse, Deo rerum ac principi gradu proximas dignitatis, genitore illo ac patre prolatas, etc. *Cap.* 62: Servare animas alius nisi Deus omnipotens non potest: nec præterea quisquam est, qui longævas facere, perpetuitatis possit et spiritum subrogare. (Comp. *Platonis Timæus*, ed. Bip. p. 325. *Justinus, Tatianus, Theophilus;* see Münschers Dogmengesch. Bd. 2. S. 101 ff). — *Cap.* 46, calls it an immanis et scelerata persuasio, ut — Deus — aliquid fecerit claudum: and hence the conclusion is drawn, ut in sacrilegæ crimen impietatis incurrat, quisquis ab eo conceperit

tantius Firmianus, (the Christian Cicero), an Italian by birth, wrote a work called *institutionum divinar.* libb. VII., at Nicomedia, during the persecution under Decius. He was afterwards the teacher of Crispus, the eldest son of Constantine the Great, and died about the year 330.[9]

The peculiarity of the theology of the Western church consisted in the gross material conception of the doctrines they had received from the East. This is seen even in their conception of God. They gave to the Deity a body, and the human soul they supposed to be literally his breath.[10] They also retained the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, of the Millennium in its lowest form,[11] of the damnation of all unbelievers, and of eternal punishment. With regard to the Logos, they retained the old Platonic notions, both as to its origin, the details of which they figured to themselves for the most part, according to the analogy of the senses,[12] and as to its relation to

---

hominem esse prognatum. *Cap.* 36: Discite ab eo, qui novit et protulit in medium, Christo, non esse animas regis maximi filias, nec ab eo, quemadmodum dicitur, generatas cœpisse se nosse; — sed alterum quempiam genitorem his esse, dignitatis et potentiæ gradibus satis plurimis ab Imperatore disjunctum, ejus tamen ex aula et eminentium nobilem sublimitate natalium (meaning no doubt the Logos). *Cap.* 47: Non enim, si negemus, muscas, scarabeos, et cimices, nitedulas, curculiones, et tineas omnipotentis esse opus regis, sequaciter postulandum a nobis est, ut quis ea fecerit institueritque dicamus. Possimus enim nulla cum reprehensione nescire, quis et illis originem dederit, et obtinere, non esse Deo a superiore prolata tam supervacua, tam vana, tam ad nullas pertinentia rationes, quinimo aliquando et noxia, et necessarias importantia læsiones. cf. *cap.* 48, 58, 61, 62. Comp. § 42. Concerning the theology of Arnobius, see *Meyer l. c. p.* 278 seq. [Murdock's Mosheim, I, 212. — Tr.]

9 *Opp. ed. J. L. Bünemann.* Lips. 1739. 8vo. *Jo. Bapt. le Brun et Nic. Lenglet Dufresnoy.* Paris. 1748. Tomi II. 4to. Baluzius found in a MS. Colbert. *Lucii Cecilii liber de Mortibus Persecutorum*, which he first published, Miscell. Tom. II. p. 1. (1679). He supposes it to be the work of Lactantius mentioned by Jerome, cat. c. 80, as *De persecutione lib.* : and it has been received into all editions of Lactantius since that time. *Le Nourry*, (Lucii Cecilii lib. de mortibus persec. ad Ms. denuo emendatus. acc. dissert. de libri auctore. Paris. 1710. 8vo.), who attempts to show that this was another L. Cecilius, is answered by *N. de Lestocq* disquis. in the ed. of le Brun. Tom. II. p XLVIII seq.

10 cf. *Tertull. adv. Prax.* 7: Quis enim negavit, deum corpus esse, etsi deus spiritus est? Spiritus enim corpus sui generis in sua effigie. Sed et si invisibilia illa, quæcunque sunt, habent apud deum et suum corpus et suam formam, per quæ soli deo visibilia sunt: quanto magis quod ex ipsius substantia missum est (namely, the λόγος), sine substantia non erit? c. 5: es animal rationale, a rationali scilicet artifice non tantum factus, sed etiam ex substantia ipsius animatus. So too *lib. de anima* on the corporalitas animæ (comp. § 50, note 6). [See *Kaye* on *Tertullian*, pp. 190–204. — Tr.]

11 *Lactant. institutt. div.* VII. c. 14–25. Amongst other things, he says, c. 24: Tum qui erunt in corporibus vivi, non morientur, sed per eosdem mille annos infinitam multitudinem generabunt, et erit soboles eorum sancta et Deo cara. Qui autem ab inferis suscitabuntur, ii præerunt viventibus velut judices. Gentes vero non extinguentur omnino: sed quædam relinquentur in victoriam Dei, ut triumphentur a justis, ac subjugentur perpetuæ servituti.

12 Cf. *Lactant.* divin. instit. IV. 8: Quomodo igitur procreavit? Primum nec sciri a quoquam possunt, nec narrari opera divina, sed tamen sanctæ literæ docent, in quibus cautum est, illum Dei filium esse Dei sermonem, itemque ceteros angelos Dei spiritus esse. Nam sermo est spiritus cum voce aliquid

the Father.[13] A phenomenon in the history of this dogma is exhibited by Dionysius, bishop of Rome (A. D. 259–270), but educated in Greece, who united Origen's idea of the eternal generation of the Logos with the very different notions on the subject of the Platonic philosophy.[14]

---

significante prolatus. Sed tamen quoniam spiritus et sermo diversis partibus proferuntur, siquidem spiritus naribus, ore sermo procedit: magna inter hunc Dei filium ceterosque angelos differentia est. Illi enim ex Deo taciti spiritus exierunt, qui non ad doctrinam Dei tradendam, sed ad ministerium creabantur. Ille vero, quum sit et ipse spiritus, tamen cum voce ac sono ex Dei ore processit, sicut verbum, etc. — Merito igitur sermo et verbum Dei dicitur, quia Deus procedentem de ore suo vocalem spiritum, quem non utero sed mente conceperat, inexcogitabili quadam majestatis suæ virtute ac potentia, in effigiem, quæ proprio sensu ac sapientia vigeat, comprehendit, et alios item spiritus suos in angelos figuravit.

13 *Tertull. adv. Hermogenem*, c. 3: Et pater deus est, et judex deus est: non tamen ideo pater et judex semper, quia deus semper. Nam nec pater potuit esse ante filium, nec judex ante delictum. Fuit autem tempus, cum ei delictum et filius non fuit, quod judicem et qui patrem dominum faceret. *Cap.* 18: Ut (Deus sophiam) necessariam sensit ad opera mundi, statim eam condit et generat in semetipso. *Adv. Praxean*, c. 26: Nulla res alicujus ipsa est, cujus est. — Et ideo spiritus Deus, et sermo Deus, quia ex Deo, non tamen ipse ex quo est. Quodsi deus, Dei tanquam substantiva res, non erit ipse Deus (αὐτόθεος): sed hactenus deus, quia ex ipsius Dei substantia, qua et substantiva res est, et ut portio aliqua totius. — Patrem et ipse adorat, — ignorans et ipse diem et horam ultimam, soli patri notam: disponens regnum discipulis, quo modo et sibi dispositum dicit a patre, etc. *Adv. Marcionem*, II. c. 27: Quæcunque exigitis Deo digna, habebuntur in patre invisibili, incongressibili, et placido, et, ut ita dixerim, philosophorum Deo. Quæcunque autem ut indigna reprehenditis, deputabuntur in filio, et viso, et audito, et congresso, arbitro patris et ministro, etc. Comp. Martini Gesch. des Dogma v. d. Gottheit Christi in d. vier ersten Jahrh. S. 100 ff. Of the same opinion with Tertullian are *Cyprian* (vid. Martini, S. 248 ff.), *Novatian* (l. c. S. 257 ff.), *Lactantius* (l. c. S. 268 ff.)

14 *Dionysii Rom.* adv. Sabellianos fragmentum (in *Athanasius* de decretis Nicæn. syn. c. 26: also in *Constant.* epist. Rom. Pont. ed. Schoenemann, p. 194 seq. *Routh.* reliqu. sacr. III. p. 175 seq.) He begins with rejectin τοὺς διαιροῦντας καὶ κατατέμνοντας — τὴν μοναρχίαν εἰς τρεῖς δυνάμεις τινὰς καὶ μεμερισμένας ὑποστάσεις καὶ θεότητας τρεῖς, and asserts on the other hand: ἡνῶσθαι γὰρ ἀνάγκη τῷ Θεῷ τῶν ὅλων τὸν θεῖον λόγον· ἐμφιλοχωρεῖν δὲ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἐνδιαιτᾶσθαι δεῖ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα· ἥδη καὶ τὴν θείαν τριάδα εἰς ἕνα, ὥσπερ εἰς κορυφήν τινα (τὸν Θεὸν τῶν ὅλων τὸν παντοκράτορα λέγω) συγκεφαλαιοῦσθαί τε καὶ συνάγεσθαι πᾶσα ἀνάγκη. He proceeds then to censure τοὺς ποίημα τὸν υἱὸν εἶναι δοξάζοντας, καὶ γεγονέναι τὸν κύριον, ὥσπερ ἕν τι ὄντως γενομένων, νομίζοντας. — Βλάσφημον οὖν οὐ τὸ τυχόν, μέγιστον μὲν οὖν, χειροποίητον τρόπον τινὰ λέγειν τὸν Κύριον. Εἰ γὰρ γέγονεν υἱός, ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν· ἀεὶ δὲ ἦν, εἴ γε ἐν τῷ πατρί ἐστιν, ὡς αὐτός φησι, καὶ εἰ λόγος καὶ σοφία καὶ δύναμις ὁ Χριστός. — ταῦτα δὲ δυνάμεις οὖσαι τοῦ Θεοῦ συγχώνευσιν· εἰ τοίνυν γέγονεν ὁ υἱός, ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν ταῦτα· ἦν ἄρα καιρὸς, ὅτε χωρὶς τούτων ἦν ὁ Θεός· ἀτοπώτατον δὲ τοῦτο. The words κύριος ἔκτισέ με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ (Prov. viii. 22) signify: ἐπίστησε τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γεγονόσιν ἔργοις, γεγονόσι δὲ δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ. — Ὦ ῥιψοκίνδυνοι ἀνθρωποι! ποίημα ὁ πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, ὁ ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου γεννηθεὶς (Ps. cix. 3), ὁ εἰπὼν ὡς σοφία (Prov. viii. 26). πρὸ δὲ πάντων βουνῶν γεννῇ με; καὶ πολλάχου δὲ τῶν θείων λογίων γεγεννῆσθαι, ἀλλ' οὐ γεγονέναι τὸν υἱὸν λεγόμενον εὕροι τις ἄν. We must therefore believe εἰς θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, καὶ εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα· ἡνῶσθαι δὲ τῷ Θεῷ τῶν ὅλων τὸν λόγον· ἐγὼ γὰρ, φησι, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (Joh. x. 30)· καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί. Οὕτω γὰρ ἂν καὶ ἡ θεία τριὰς, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον κήρυγμα τῆς μοναρχίας διασώζοιτο. comp. Martini, l. c. S. 277 ff.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

USAGES OF THE CHURCH.

§ 65.

The changes, which took place in the usages of the church during this period, may be more particularly traced to certain ideas, the germs of which we find as early as the second century, though not fully developed till the third. The most important of these was the idea of a Catholic church, beyond whose pale there could be no salvation (§ 49). This was doubtless perfectly consistent with the spirit of Christianity, as long as it meant only a moral union amongst Christians, as engaged in a common effort to enter the kingdom of Heaven; but as certainly not so in the sense of a visible, limited association.[1] But after men had begun to confound religious faith with forms of confession, they began also to consider uniformity in each alike necessary to the unity of the church, and more and more to fetter freedom of inquiry. How soon and how generally this was extended to church usages, we may see by Victor's example in the matter of the celebration of Easter (p. 126); and from that time forward, particularly in the Western church, we may trace the constant effort to bring about a uniformity in external usages. The idea of a Catholic church led also, naturally, to a more intimate external union amongst the separate churches: and as this union took place through the bishops, their dignity and consequence were thus greatly increased.

Another notion of no little influence was, that the Christian church was only a nobler copy of the Jewish temple, and therefore that the laws of Moses concerning public worship, especially as far as concerned the priesthood, were still binding on the Christians (vid. § 52).

No less fruitful in consequences was the notion, current since the end of the second century, that there were certain rites, or *mysteries* (τελεταὶ, Origen c. Cels. III. p. 147),[2] to which none could be ad-

---

[1] Comp. especially *Cyprianus de unitate ecclesiæ.* e. g. Quisquis ab ecclesia segregatus adulteræ jungitur, a promissis ecclesiæ separatur. Nec perveniet ad Christi præmia, qui relinquit ecclesiam Christi. Alienus est, profanus est, hostis est. Habere jam non potest Deum patrem, qui ecclesiam non habet matrem. Si potuit evadere quisquam, qui extra arcam Noë fuit, et qui extra ecclesiam foris fuerit, evadet. — Tales etiamsi occisi in confessione nominis fuerint, macula ista nec sanguine abluitur. — Esse martyr non potest, qui in ecclesia non est. — Occidi talis potest, coronari non potest, etc. *Origenes hom. III. in Josuam*, § 5: Nemo semetipsum decipiat: extra hanc domum, i. e. extra Ecclesiam nemo salvatur. Nam si quis foras exierit, mortis suæ ipse fit reus.

[2] *Tertull. de præscript. hæret.* 41: Non omittam ipsius etiam conversationis hæreticæ descriptionem: quam futilis, quam terrena, quam humana sit: sine gravitate, sine auctoritate, sine disciplina, ut fidei suæ congruens. *In primis, quis catechumenus, quis fidelis, incertum est: pariter adeunt, pariter orant: etiam ethnici, si supervenerint:* sanctum canibus, et porcis margaritas, licet non veras,

mitted but such as had been already baptized, — a notion which no doubt grew chiefly out of the peculiar relations of the Christians of that time, though its origin is partly to be sought in the imitation of the numerous Heathen mysteries (vid. p. 71). Much may be gathered for the history of church usages in this period from the *constitutiones et canones apostolicæ* [vid. § 33, note 3.]

§ 66.

HISTORY OF THE HIERARCHY.

We have seen (§ 52) that the sphere of individual influence amongst the bishops was gradually enlarging, many churches in the city and its vicinity being united under one bishop, a presbyter * or a country bishop † presiding over them. But we have now to speak of a new institution, at first found chiefly in the East, which had the effect of uniting the bishops more intimately amongst themselves. This was the Provincial Synod, which had been growing more frequent ever since the end of the second century, and in some provinces was held once or twice every year.[1] As these Synods were, for the most part, convened in the principal city of the province, the bishop of that city of course presided; and in this way these bishops

---

jactabunt. *Apologet.* c. 7. — This was at first, however, confined to *the exclusion* of the catechumens from such rites. The church fathers of the third century do not scruple to speak of them, as of every thing else pertaining to Christianity, without reserve; and Tertullian even reproaches the Valentinians (adv. Val. 1), nihil magis curant quam occultare quod prædicant. It was not till the fourth century that the positive doctrines of Christianity began to be treated as mysteries. The Catholics have availed themselves of these mysteries (called usually disciplina arcani) to account for the circumstance, that their peculiar institutions are not to be found in antiquity. See especially *Eman. a Schelstrate* de disciplina arcani, Rom. 1685. 4to. Comp. G. E. Tentzel diss. de disciplina arcani, in his Exercitt. Select. Lips. 1692. 4to. — This disciplina arcani, however, only excluded those not yet baptized, and is wholly different from the system of Clement. Alex. and Origen, whose Gnosis was confined to the initiated even amongst Christians. (vid. § 61, note 3.)

* See Dionys. Alex. ap. Euseb. h. e. VII. 24, 4, Conc. Illib. ann. 305, can. 77. Conc. Neocæsar. ann. 315, can. 13.

† See Epist. Syn. Antioch. ann. 270 in Euseb. h. e. VII. 30, 6. Conc. Ancyranum ann. 315, can. 13. cf. Bingham, I. p. 192 seq. Planck's Gesellsch. Verfassung, I. S. 73 ff. In Africa, where the country bishops were particularly numerous, they were in no wise distinguished from the city bishops, not even in name. cf. *St. A. Morcelli* Africa Christiana, P. I. p. 43.

1 *Firmiliani* epist. ad Cyprian. (in epist. Cyprian. 75): Qua ex causa necessario apud nos fit, ut per singulos annos seniores et præpositi in unum conveniamus ad disponenda ea, quæ curæ nostræ commissa sunt, ut si qua graviora sunt, communi consilio dirigantur. *Canon. Apost.* 36: *Δεύτερον τοῦ ἔτους σύνοδος γινέσθω τῶν ἐπισκόπων, καὶ ἀνακρινέτωσαν ἀλλήλους τὰ δόγματα τῆς εὐσεβείας, καὶ τὰς ἐμπιστούσας ἐκκλησιαστικὰς ἀντιλογίας διαλυέτωσαν.* So also *Conc. Nicæni* can. 5. [Vid. § 52, note 5.]

(Metropolitans)[2] came to exercise a sort of superintendence over the others. As yet, however, this was the case only in the East. In the West, it is true, Rome was considered as the ecclesiastical metropolis of a great part of Italy, and in Africa a somewhat similar diocesan regulation had been adopted,[3] though in general the number of churches was too small to admit as yet of such hierarchal associations.[4]

By these associations of large ecclesiastical bodies the whole church became better organized and united. Through the medium of the Metropolitans the testimonies and other papers of the separate churches [5] were better attested and more securely forwarded; the intelligence of all important events and resolutions in the church was more expeditiously and universally circulated, and thus each church always kept acquainted with the general condition of all the churches.

The bishops of the three great cities of the Roman empire, Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, had likewise the largest dioceses. Hence they were considered as the heads of the church, and in all general affairs particular deference was paid to their opinion. Still, however, great stress was laid on the perfect equality of all bishops, and each in his own diocese was answerable only to God and his conscience.[6] Nor were they likely to allow any peculiar authority

---

2 This subordination, first authorized by custom, was afterwards established as a principle. *Conc. Antiocheni* (341) can. 9: τοὺς καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν ἐπισκόπους εἰδέναι χρὴ, τὸν ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει προεστῶτα ἐπίσκοπον καὶ τὴν φροντίδα ἀναδέχεσθαι πάσης τῆς ἐπαρχίας, διὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει πανταχόθεν συντρέχειν πάντας τοὺς πράγματα ἔχοντας. Ὅθεν ἔδοξε καὶ τῇ τιμῇ προηγεῖσθαι αὐτὸν, μηδὲν τε πράττειν περιττὸν τοὺς λοιποὺς ἐπισκόπους ἄνευ αὐτοῦ, κατὰ τὸν ἀρχαῖον κρατήσαντα τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν κανόνα, ἢ ταῦτα μόνα ὅσα τῇ ἑκάστου ἐπιβάλλει παροικίᾳ, καὶ ταῖς ὑπ' αὐτὴν χώραις. ἕκαστον γὰρ ἐπίσκοπον ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ παροικίας, διοικεῖν τε κατὰ τὴν ἑκάστῳ ἐπιβάλλουσαν εὐλάβειαν, καὶ πρόνοιαν ποιεῖσθαι πάσης τῆς χώρας τῆς ὑπὸ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ πόλιν, ὡς καὶ χειροτονεῖν πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους, καὶ μετὰ κρίσεως ἕκαστα διαλαμβάνειν· περαιτέρω δὲ μηδὲν πράττειν ἐπιχειρεῖν δίχα τοῦ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐπισκόπου, μὴ δὲ αὐτὸν ἄνευ τῆς τῶν λοιπῶν γνώμης. *Bacchinii* libb. III. de origine hierarchiæ ecclesiasticæ. Mutinæ. 1704. 4to. Vid. W. C. L. Zieglers pragmat. Geschichte der kirchl. Verfassungsformen in den ersten 6 Jahrh. der Kirche. Leipzig. 1798. 8vo. S. 61–161.

3 Every province of Africa had a primate, who, in Mauretania and Numidia was always the oldest bishop (hence senex, vid. *Bingham*, vol. I. p. 214), and in Africa proconsularis, the Bishop of Carthage. This last was at the same time the head of all the provinces, and could summon general councils. cf. *Cypriani epist.* 45: Latius fusa est nostra provincia: habet enim Numidiam et Mauretaniam sibi cohærentes. Ziegler in Henkes Neuem Magazin, Bd. 1. S. 172 ff.

4 Comp. *Ballerini* observatt. ad Quesnelli diss. V. P. II. in their edition of the Opp. Leonis, Tom. II. p. 1030 seq. Zieglers Gesch. der kirchl. Verfassungsformen. S. 79 ff.

5 *Literæ formatæ* (cf. formalis epistola. Sueton. in Domit. c. 13.) ἐπιστολαὶ συστατικαὶ — ἀπολυτικὰ γράμματα literæ dimissoriæ — ἐπιστολαὶ κοινωνικαὶ literæ communicatoriæ (later ἐνθρονιστικαὶ) — ἐπιστολαὶ συνοδικαὶ, ἐγκύκλιοι (l. circulares), etc.

6 *Cyprian. de unitate ecclesiæ:* Quam unitatem firmiter tenere et vindicare debemus, maxime episcopi, qui in ecclesia præsidemus, ut Episcopatum quoque ipsum unum atque indivisum probemus. — Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur. *Ej. Epist.* 52: Episcopatus unus episcoporum

to the successor of Peter, inasmuch as they attributed to Peter no superiority over the other Apostles.[7] In the West, indeed, a certain regard was paid to the church of Rome as the largest, and the only one in that region founded by an Apostle; but by no means were any

---

multorum concordi numerositate diffusus. *Cypr. alloeutio in Conc. Carthag.* (A. D. 256): Superest, ut de hac ipsa re, quid singuli sentiamus, proferamus, neminem judicantes, aut a jure communionis aliquem, si diversum senserit, amoventes. Neque enim quisquam nostrum episcopum se esse episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit, quando habeat omnis episcopus pro licentia libertatis et potestatis suæ arbitrium proprium, tanquam judicari ab alio non possit, cum nec ipse possit alterum judicare. Sed expectemus universi judicium domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui unus et solus habet potestatem et præponendi nos in ecclesiæ suæ gubernatione, et de actu nostro judicandi. — Comp. his letter to two Roman bishops, *ad Cornelium* (*epist.* 55, see below, note 8) *ad Stephanum* (epist. 72): Cæterum scimus, quosdam quod semel imbiberint nolle deponere, nec propositum suum facile mutare, sed salvo inter collegas pacis et concordiæ vinculo quædam propria, quæ apud se semel sint usurpata, retinere. Qua in re nec vos vim cuiquam facimus aut legem damus, quando habeat in ecclesiæ administratione voluntatis suæ arbitrium liberum unusquisque præpositus, rationem actus sui Domino redditurus.

[7] *Clemens Alex.* above, § 27, note 7. *Origenes* ad Matth. xvi. 18 (Comment. in Matth. Tom. XII. § 10): — *πέτρα γὰρ πᾶς ὁ Χριστοῦ μαθητής,* — *καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν τοιαύτην πέτραν οἰκοδομεῖται ὁ ἐκκλησιαστικὸς πᾶς λόγος, καὶ ἡ κατ' αὐτὸν πολιτεία.* — § 11: *Εἰ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν ἕνα ἐκεῖνον Πέτρον νομίζεις ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ οἰκοδομεῖσθαι τὴν πᾶσαν ἐκκλησίαν μόνον, τί ἂν φήσαις περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ τῆς βροντῆς υἱοῦ, ἢ ἑκάστου τῶν Ἀποστόλων; Ἄλλως τε ἄρα τολμήσωμεν λέγειν, ὅτι Πέτρου μὲν ἰδίως πύλαι ᾅδου οὐ κατισχύσουσι, τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν Ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῶν τελείων κατισχύσουσιν; — ἆρα δὲ τῷ Πέτρῳ μόνῳ δίδονται ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου αἱ κλεῖδες τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἕτερος τῶν μακαρίων αὐτὰς λήψεται;* — *Παρῴνυμοι γὰρ πέτρας πάντες οἱ μιμηταὶ Χριστοῦ.* — *Χριστοῦ μέλη ὄντες παρῴνυμοι ἐχρημάτισαν Χριστιανοί, πέτρας δὲ Πέτροι.* — *καὶ πρὸς πάντας τοὺς τοιούτους ἂν λέγοιτο ἀπὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος τὸ λέγον· σὺ εἶ Πέτρος καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς.* — Hence § 14: *λέλεκται τῷ Πέτρῳ καὶ παντὶ Πέτρῳ.* *Cyprian. ep.* 27: Dominus noster — episcopi honorem et ecclesiæ suæ rationem disponens in evangelio loquitur et dicit Petro: *Ego tibi dico, quia tu es Petrus*, etc. (Matth. xvi. 18, 19). — Inde per temporum et successionum vices episcoporum ordinatio et ecclesiæ ratio decurrit, ut ecclesia super episcopos constituatur, et omnis actus ecclesiæ per eosdem præpositos gubernetur. — *Cyprian. de unitate ecclesiæ:* Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum: "Ego tibi dico," inquit, "quia tu es Petrus," etc. (Matth. xvi. 18, 19). [*Et iterum eidem post resurrectionem suam dicit:* "*Pasce oves meas*" (Johan. xxi. 15)]. Super illum unum ædificat ecclesiam suam, [*et illi pascendas mandat oves suas,*] et quamvis Apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat et dicat: "sicut misit me pater" etc. (Joh. xx. 21, 23): tamen ut unitatem manifestaret, [*unam cathedram constituit, et*] unitatis ejusdem origenem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate disposuit. Hoc erant utique et cæteri Apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi et honoris et potestatis: sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, [*et primatus Petro datur, ut una Christi ecclesia et cathedra una monstretur. Et pastores sunt omnes, et grex unus ostenditur, qui ab Apostolis omnibus unanimi consensione pascatur,*] ut ecclesia Christi una monstretur. — Hanc ecclesiæ unitatem qui non tenet, tenere se fidem credit? Qui ecclesiæ renititur et resistit, [*qui cathedrom Petri, super quem fundata est ecclesia, deserit,*] in ecclesia se esse confidit? The passages in brackets are wanting in the oldest MSS. and are interpolations made by the Roman church, vid. especially *Rigaltii observatt. ad Cypr.* p. 162 seq. and *Baluzii* notæ 11–15, to the lib. de unit. eccl. (which last, however, have suffered somewhat at the hands of the Benedictine editors.) These interpolations, nevertheless, have quite a different sense in the mouth of Cyprian from that meant by those who inserted them. The expression, for

peculiar rights conceded to it over the other churches.[8] Of course this would be still less the case in the East.[9]

As all bishops were supposed to be of like dignity and power so also they considered themselves as having like duties towards the church in general, apart from those to their own particular dioceses.[10] Thus they maintained their common right to interfere in any case, where a bishop had transgressed the established rules of the church, with their admonitions, reprimands, and even ecclesiastical punishment;[11] though this common right was, of course, most frequently exercised by the most respected and powerful amongst them.

---

instance, primatus Petro datur, would be explained by *Ejusd. epist.* 71: Nam nec Petrus, quem *primum* Dominus elegit, et super quem ædificavit ecclesiam suam, cum secum Paulus de circumcisione postmodum disceptaret, vindicavit sibi aliquid insolenter aut arroganter assumsit, ut diceret, se *primatum* tenere, et obtemperari *a novellis et posteris* sibi potius oportere.

8 *Cypriani Epist.* 55, *ad Cornelium Episc. Romanum*, who had received the excommunicated Felicissimus as the ambassador of the bishop Fortunatus: — Satis miratus sum, cum animadvertissem, te minis atque terroribus eorum, qui venerant, aliquantum esse commotum, cum te, secundum quod scripsisti, agressi essent, cum summa desperatione comminantes, quod si litteras quas attulerant non accepisses, publice eas recitarent, et multa turpia ac probrosa et ore suo digna proferrent. Quod si ita res est, frater carissime, ut nequissimorum timeatur audacia, — actum est de episcopatus vigore etc. — Quibus etiam satis non fuit ab evangelio recessisse, — foris sibi extra ecclesiam et contra ecclesiam constituisse conventiculum perditæ factionis. — Post ista adhuc insuper pseudo-episcopo sibi ab hæreticis constituto *navigare audent et ad Petri cathedram atque ad ecclesiam principalem, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est*, a schismaticis et profanis litteras ferre, nec cogitare eos esse Romanos quorum fides Apostolo prædicante laudata est (*Rom.* i. 8), ad quos perfidia habere non possit accessum. Quæ autem causa veniendi et pseudoepiscopum contra episcopos factum nuntiandi? Aut enim placet illis quod fecerunt, et in suo scelere perseverant: aut si displicet et recedunt, sciunt quo revertantur. *Nam cum statutum sit ab omnibus nobis, et æquum sit pariter ac justum, ut uniuscujusque causa illic audiatur, ubi est crimen admissum; et singulis pastoribus portio gregis sit adscripta, quam regat unusquisque et gubernet, rationem sui actus Domino redditurus:* oportet utique eos quibus præsumus non circumcursare, nec episcoporum concordiam cohærentem sua subdola et fallaci temeritate collidere, sed agere illic causam suam, ubi et accusatores habere et testes sui criminis possint; *nisi si paucis desperatis et perditis minor videtur esse auctoritas episcoporum in Africa constitutorum, qui jam de illis judicaverunt.* — Jam causa eorum cognita est, jam de eis dicta sententia est: nec censuræ congruit sacerdotum mobilis atque inconstantis animi levitate reprehendi, cum Dominus doceat et dicat: *Sit sermo vester, est est, non non* (*Matth.* v. 37). — In his letters Cyprian calls the Roman bishops *frater* and *collega.* — Whence the predominance of these last in the West arose is evident from *Synodi Arelatensis* (A. D. 314) *Epist. II. ad Sylvestrum Papam:* Placuit etiam ante scribi ad te, qui majores diœceses tenes, et per te potissimum omnibus insinuari. Quid autem sit, quod senserimus, scripto nostræ mediocritatis subjunximus.

9 *Firmiliani ep. ad Cypr.* (l. c.): Eos autem, qui Romæ sunt, non ea in omnibus observare, quæ sint ab origine tradita, et frustra Apostolorum auctoritatem prætendere, scire quis etiam inde potest, quod circa celebrandos dies Paschæ et circa multa alia divinæ rei sacramenta videat esse apud illos aliquas diversitates, nec observari illic omnia æqualiter, quæ Hierosolymis observantur.

10 Vid. especially *Cypriani Epist.* 67, below, note 11.

11 *L. E. du Pin* de antiqua ecclesiæ disciplina dissertt. hist. Paris. 1686. p. 141 seq. — *e. g.* the condemnation of *Paul of Samosata* (§ 58. cf. du Pin,

§ 67.

(Continuation). GOVERNMENT OF THE SEPARATE CHURCHES.

When once the idea of the Mosaic priesthood had been adopted in the Christian church, the clergy soon began to assume a superiority over the laity. The customary form of consecration was now supposed to have a certain mystic influence, and henceforward they stand in the position of persons appointed by God to be the medium of communication between Him and the Christian world.[1]

---

p. 154). — Reprimand of Dionysius of Alexandria (§ 62. Du Pin, p. 152). — With reference to Marcian, bishop of Arles, who had gone over to the Novatians, *Cyprian. Ep.* 67 *ad Stephan. Ep. Rom.* Cui rei nostrum est consulere et subvenire, frater carissime. — Quapropter facere te oportet plenissimas litteras ad coëpiscopos nostros in Galliis constitutos, ne ultra Marcianum pervicacem — collegio nostro insultare patiantur, quod necdum videatur a nobis abstentus. — Dirigantur in provinciam et ad plebem Arelate consistentem a te litteræ, quibus abstento Marciano alius in locum ejus substituatur, et grex Christi, qui in hodiernum ab illo dissipatus et vulneratus contemnitur, colligatur. Sufficiat multos illic ex fratribus nostris annis istis superioribus excessisse sine pace. Vel ceteris subveniatur qui supersunt. — *Iccirco enim, frater carissime, copiosum corpus est sacerdotum concordiæ mutuæ glutino atque unitatis vinculo copulatum, ut si quis ex collegio nostro hæresim facere et gregem Christi lacerare et vastare tentaverit, subveniant ceteri, et quasi pastores utiles et misericordes oves dominicas in gregem colligant.* Quid enim si in mari portus aliquis munitionibus suis ruptis infestus et periculosus esse navibus cœperit, nonne navigantes ad alios proximos portus naves suas dirigunt, ubi sit tutus accessus et salutaris introitus et statio secura? — Quod nunc esse apud nos debet, frater carissime, ut fratres nostros, qui jactati Marciani scopulis petunt ecclesiæ portus salutares, suscipiamus ad nos prompta et benigna humanitate. — *Nam etsi pastores multi sumus, unum tamen gregem pascimus, et oves universas, quas Christus sanguine suo et passione quæsivit, colligere et fovere debemus etc.* Then the affair of the Spanish bishops *Basilides* and *Martialis* (A. D. 256), in which Cyprian being called upon to mediate, rejected the decision of the bishop of Rome in their favor. *Epist.* 68, *ad clerum et plebes in Hispania consistentes:* Nec rescindere ordinationem (Sabini) jure perfectam potest, quod Basilides post crimina sua detecta et conscientiam etiam propria confessione nudatam, Romam pergens, Stephanum collegam nostrum longe positum et gestæ rei ac veritatis ignarum fefellit, ut exambiret reponi se injuste in episcopatum, de quo fuerat jure depositus. — Etsi aliqui de collegis nostris exstiterint (namely, *Stephanus*), fratres dilectissimi, qui deificam disciplinam negligendam putant, et cum Basilide et Martiale temere communicant, conturbare fidem nostram res ista non debet etc. — cf. *Du Pin*, p. 150.

1 *Cypriani epist.* 55: Nam cum scriptum sit: *Qui dixerit fratri, suo fatue, etc.* (Matth. v. 22), quomodo possunt censuram Domini ultoris evadere, qui talia ingerunt, non solum fratribus, sed et sacerdotibus, quibus honor tantus de Dei dignatione conceditur, ut quisquis sacerdoti ejus et ad tempus hic judicanti non obtemperaret, statim necaretur. — Neque enim aliunde hæreses obortæ sunt, aut nata sunt schismata, quam inde quod sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur, nec unus in ecclesia ad tempus sacerdos et ad tempus judex vice Christi cogitatur. — *Epist.* 69 *ad Florent. Pupianum:* — Animadverto te — in mores nostros diligenter inquirere, et post Deum judicem, qui sacerdotes facit, te velle, non dicam de me (quantus enim ego sum?) sed de Dei et Christi judicio judicare. Hoc est in Deum non credere, hoc est rebellem adversus Christum et adversus evangelium ejus exsistere, ut — tu existimes, sacerdotes Dei sine conscientia ejus in ecclesia ordinari. — Quamobrem, frater, si majestatem Dei, qui sacerdotes

For the more humble duties of the clergy new offices were appointed: ὑποδιάκονοι, ἀκόλουθοι, ἐξορκισταὶ, ἀναγνῶσται, πυλωροί; afterwards called *ordines minores.*[2] The greatest change was in the situation of the bishops (*Papa*, Tert. de pudic. 13. — Πάπα ἱερώτατος, Gregor. Thaum. epist. can. 1. — *Præpositus*, Cyprian. epist. 55), whose power and consequence were increased as well by the enlargement of their dioceses and the multiplication of the inferior clergy, as by the operation of the Synods; the effect of which was only too often to awaken in them ambition and avarice.[3] The old customs, however, were not yet entirely done away. Although the provincial bishops exercised a very decided influence in electing a Metropolitan, the church was not excluded from all share in the

---

ordinat, cogitaveris, si Christum, qui arbitrio et nutu ac præsentia sua et præpositos ipsos et ecclesiam cum præpositis gubernat, aliquando respexeris, si temeritatis — tuæ agere vel sero pœnitentiam cœperis, si Deo et Christo ejus — plenissime satisfeceris; communicationis tuæ poterimus habere rationem: manente tamen apud nos divinæ censuræ respectu et metu, ut prius Dominum meum consulam, an tibi pacem dari, et te ad communicationem ecclesiæ suæ admitti sua ostensione et admonitione permittat. Memini enim, quid jam mihi sit ostensum, immo quid sit servo obsequenti et timenti dominica et divina auctoritate præceptum: qui inter cætera quæ ostendere et revelare dignatus est, et hoc addidit: *Itaque qui Christo non credit sacerdotem facienti, et postea credere incipiet sacerdotem vindicanti. cf. Epistt.* 45, 52, 65.

2 First the lectores mentioned *Tertull.* de præscr. 41. The others we meet with first in Cyprian and in epist. *Cornelii* (Roman bishop, A. D. 252) ap. Euseb. VI. 43, according to whom there were in Rome 40 Presbyters, 7 Deacons, 7 Subdeacons, 42 Acoluthi, and 42 Exorcists, Lectores, and Ostiarii. — In the Oriental church there were some variations. In the Constit. Apost. III. 11, and elsewhere, we meet with Ψάλται, and on the other hand, there are no Acoluthi and Exorcists. — *Socrat.* hist. eccl. V. 22, ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἀναγνῶσται καὶ ὑποβολεῖς ἀδιάφορον, εἴτε κατηχούμενοι εἰσὶν, εἴτε πιστοί.

3 *Origenes* in Exod. hom. XI. § 6: Quis autem hodie eorum, qui populis præsunt, non dico si jam aliqua ei a Deo revelata sunt, sed in legis scientia aliquid meriti habet, consilium dignatur inferioris saltem sacerdotis accipere? nedum dixerim laici vel gentilis. *Idem in Matthæum*, Tom. XVI. § 8. (on Luc. xxii. 25, 26): Ἡμεῖς — τοιουτοί ἐσμεν, ὡς ἐνίοτε καὶ τὸν τῶν κακῶς ἀρχόντων ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὑπερβάλλειν τύφον, καὶ μονονουχὶ ζητεῖν ὡς οἱ βασιλεῖς δορυφόρους, καὶ φοβεροὺς ἑαυτοὺς καὶ δυσπροσίτους μάλιστα τοῖς πένησι κατασκευάζοντες, τοιουτοί ἐσμεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας ἡμῖν, καὶ περί τινων ἀξιοῦντας, ὡς οὐδὲ οἱ τύραννοι, καὶ ὠμότεροι τῶν ἀρχόντων πρὸς τοὺς ἱκέτας. Καὶ ἔστι γε ἰδεῖν ἐν πολλαῖς νομιζομέναις ἐκκλησίαις, καὶ μάλιστα ταῖς τῶν μειζόνων πόλεων, τοὺς ἡγουμένους τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, μηδεμίαν ἰσολογίαν ἐπιτρέποντας, ἔοδ' ὅτε καὶ τοῖς καλλίστοις τῶν Ἰησοῦ μαθητῶν, εἶναι πρὸς αὐτούς. — καὶ ταῦτα πάντα μοι λέλεκται βουλομένῳ κατὰ τὸν λόγον παραστῆσαι, ὅτι οὐ μιμητέον τῷ ἄρχοντι τῆς ἐκκλησίας τὸν ἄρχοντα τῶν ἐθνῶν κ. τ. λ. cf. ej. *in Matth. commentariorum series*, § 9: Sicut autem super cathedram Moysi, — sic et super cathedram ecclesiasticam sedent quidam dicentes, quæ facere oporteat unumquemque, non autem facientes, et alligantes onera gravia et imponunt super humeros hominum, ipsi nec digito volentes ea movere (Matth. xxiii. 2, 3.) — *ibid.* § 10, 12, 14, 61. — *Cyprian. de lapsis:* Episcopi plurimi, quos et hortamento esse oportet cæteris et exempło, divina procuratione contemta, procuratores rerum sæcularium fieri; derelicta cathedra, plebe deserta, per alienas provincias oberrantes, negotiationis quæstuosæ nundinas aucupari: esurientibus in ecclesia fratribus, habere argentum largiter velle, fundos insidiosis fraudibus rapere, usuris multiplicantibus fenus augere.

choice.[4] The inferior clergy, it is true, were appointed solely by the bishop, but the choice of a Presbyter must be approved by the people.[5] In the discharge of his duties too the bishop must not only consult his Presbyters,[6] but in certain cases must bring questions before the whole church.[7] And, finally, there were even cases in

---

[4] *Cyprian. epist.* 68: Plebs ipsa maxime habet potestatem vel eligendi dignos sacerdotes, vel indignos recusandi. Quod et ipsum videmus de divina auctoritate descendere, ut sacerdos plebe præsente sub omnium oculis deligatur, et dignus atque idoneus publico judicio ac testimonio comprobetur, sicut in Numeris Dominus Moysi præcepit dicens: *Apprehende Aaron fratrem et Eleazarum filium ejus, et impone eos in montem coram omni synagoga*, etc. (Num. xx. 25). Coram omni synagoga jubet Deus constitui sacerdotem, id est, instruit et ostendit, ordinationes sacerdotales non nisi sub populi assistentis conscientia fieri oportere, ut plebe præsente vel detegantur malorum crimina vel bonorum merita prædicentur, et sit ordinatio justa et legitima, quæ omnium suffragio et judicio fuerit examinata. — Propter quod diligenter de traditione divina et apostolica observatione servandum est et tenendum, quod apud nos quoque et fere per provincias universas tenetur, ut ad ordinationes rite celebrandas ad eam plebem, cui præpositus ordinatur, episcopi ejusdem provinciæ proximi quique conveniant, et episcopus deligatur plebe præsente, quæ singulorum vitam plenissime novit, et uniuscujusque actum de ejus conversatione perspexit. *Origenes in Levit. hom. VI. c.* 3. Hence Cyprian: Episcopus factus de Dei et Christi ejus judicio, de Clericorum testimonio, de Plebis suffragio (*Epist.* 52, cf. *Ep.* 41.) cf. *Lamprid. in Alex. Sev.* c. 45 (§ 55, not. 6).

[5] *Cyprian. ep.* 65: Diaconi ab episcopis fiunt. — *Ep.* 33, *ad Clerum de plebem Carthag:* In ordinationibus clericis, fratres carissimi, solemus vos ante consulere, et mores ac merita singulorum communi consilio ponderare. *Cornelii epist. ad Fabium* (ap. Euseb. VI. 43, 7): On occasion of the ordination of Novatian as Presbyter, the bishop is mentioned as διακωλυόμενος ὑπὸ παντὸς τοῦ κλήρου, ἀλλὰ καὶ λαϊκῶν πολλῶν — — ἠξίωσε συγχωρηθῆναι αὐτῷ τοῦτον μόνον χειροτονῆσαι. cf. Valesius ad. h. l.

[6] In Cyprian often: consulere presbyterium, consilio communi res tractare, etc. Comp. *Conc. Cathagin. gener. IV.* A. D. 398, *can.* 23 (*Mansii III. p.* 953): Episcopus nullus causam audiat absque præsentia clericorum suorum: alioquin irrita sit sententia Episcopi, nisi clericorum sententia confirmatur. Concerning the right of suffrage at the Synods, see Ziegler in Henkes Neuem Magazin, Bd. I. S. 165 ff.

[7] *Cyprian. Ep.* 5 *ad Presbyt. et Diac.:* Quando a primordio episcopatus mei statuerim, nihil sine consilio vestro et sine consensu plebis mea privatim sententia gerere. Especially with reference to the readmittance of the *lapsi. Cypriani Ep.* 11 *ad plebem:* Exspectent (lapsi) regressionem nostram, ut — convocati episcopi plures secundum Domini disciplinam et Confessorum præsentiam, et vestram quoque sententiam beatorum martyrum litteras et desideria examinare possimus. *Ep.* 13 *ad Clerum:* Hoc enim et verecundiæ et disciplinæ et vitæ ipsi omnium nostrum convenit, ut præpositi cum clero convenientes, præsente etiam stantium plebe, quibus et ipsis pro fide et timore suo honor habendus est, disponere omnia consilii communis religione possimus. *Ep.* 17 *ad Presbyt. et Diac.:* Quæ res cum omnium nostrum consilium et sententiam exspectet, præjudicare ego et soli mihi rem communem vindicare non audeo. *Ep.* 28 *ad eosdem:* Cui rei non potui me solum judicem dare, cum — hæc singulorum tractanda sit et limanda plenius ratio, non tantum cum collegis meis, sed et cum plebe ipsa universa. That the same principles were acted on in Rome is evident from the *Ep. Cleri Rom. ad Cypr.* (Ep. Cypr. 31). — *Cypriani Ep.* 9 *ad Clerum:* Presbyters who have admitted the *lapsi* to church communion, must agere et apud nos, et apud confessores ipsos, et apud plebem universam causam suam. cf. *Du Pin* de ant. eccl. disc. p. 246 seq. *J. H. Boehmeri XII. dissertt. juris eccl. ant. ed.* II. p. 149 seq.

which laymen, learned in the Scriptures, gave public instruction in the church with the permission of the bishop.[8]

§ 68.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

The custom of considering certain doctrines and rites as mysteries would naturally have some effect on the mode of admission to the church. Baptism was preceded by a long preparatory course, during which the Catechumens (*κατηχούμενοι*) were gradually led from general religious and moral truths to the peculiar doctrines of Christianity, by teachers appointed for the purpose *(catechistes)*, and must pass through various grades *(audientes, genuflectentes, competentes)* before they were deemed fit to be actually admitted.[1] This course usually occupied several years, and often the catechumens voluntarily deferred their baptism as long as possible on account of the remission of sins by which it was accompanied. Hence it was often necessary to baptize the sick, and in that case sprinkling *(baptismus clinicorum, τῶν κλινικῶν)*[2] was substituted for the usual rite. The baptism of infants became now more common.[3] The use of exorcism is distinctly mentioned,[4] and all who had been baptized, even the children, partook of the Eucharist.

---

8 *Epist. Alexandri Episc. Hierosol. et Theoctisti Cæsariensis ad Demetrium Alexandr.* (ap. Euseb. VI. 19, 7) in the case of Origen: Προσίθηκας δὲ τοῖς γράμμασιν, ὅτι τοῦτο οὐδέ ποτε ἠκούσθη, οὐδὲ νῦν γεγένηται, τὸ, παρόντων ἐπισκόπων λαϊκοὺς ὁμιλεῖν, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως προφανῶς οὐκ ἀληθῆ λέγων. Ὅπου γοῦν εὐρίσκονται οἱ ἐπιτήδειοι πρὸς τὸ ὠφέλειν τοὺς ἀδελφούς, καὶ παρακαλοῦνται, τῷ λαῷ προσομιλεῖν, ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων ἐπισκόπων· ὥσπερ ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ Εὔελπις ὑπὸ Νέωνος, καὶ ἐν Ἰκονίῳ Παυλῖνος ὑπὸ Κέλσου, καὶ ἐν Συννάδοις Θεόδωρος ὑπὸ Ἀττικοῦ τῶν μακαρίων ἀδελφῶν. εἰκὸς δὲ καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις τόποις τοῦτο γίνεσθαι, ἡμᾶς δὲ μὴ εἰδέναι. So also *Constitt. Apost.* VIII. c. 32, amongst the Κανόνες διάφοροι Παύλου: ὁ διδάσκων, εἰ καὶ λαϊκὸς ᾖ, ἔμπειρος δὲ τοῦ λόγου, καὶ τὸν τρόπον σεμνός, διδασκέτω· ἔσονται γὰρ πάντες διδακτοὶ Θεοῦ (Jo. vi. 45). Even as late as *Conc. Carthag. gener.* IV. c. 98, (*Mansi* III. p. 959): Laicus præsentibus clericis nisi ipsis jubentibus docere non audeat.

1 With Tertullian and Cyprian *audientes* and *Catechumeni* are as yet the same. The *γονυκλίνοντες* mentioned first *Conc. Neocæsar.* can. 5. *Nicæni* can. 14. *Tob. Pfanner* de Catechumenis antiquæ ecclesiæ. Francof. et Goth. 1688. 12mo. *Bingham* Antiquitt. lib. X. (vol. IV.)

2 Cf. *Cyprioni Ep.* 76 *ad Magnum*, showing that the baptism of such persons was not the less efficacious, eo quod aqua salutari non loti sunt, sed perfusi.

3 Comp. § 52. Origen found the baptism of infants already established and defended it. *Walli* hist. baptism. infant. P. I. p. 72 seq. — *Fidus*, an African bishop, believed, considerandam esse legem circumcisionis antiquæ, ut intra octavum diem eum, qui natus est, baptizandum et sanctificandum non putaret. *Cyprian*, on the other hand, with his synod (epist. 64 ad Fidum): A baptismo atque a gratia Dei, qui omnibus et misericors, et benignus, et pius est, neminem per nos debere prohiberi. *Wall*, l. c. p. 94 seq.

4 Comp. § 52, note 19. *Vincentius a Thibari* (in Conc. Carth. A. D. 256): Ergo primo per manus impositionem in exorcismo, secundo per baptismi regenerationem, tunc possunt ad Christi pollicitationem venire.

As those who had been excommunicated were supposed to be subject to the Devil[5] as much as those not yet baptized, they had to undergo a similar, though more rigorous probation before they could be again received.[6] The Novatian Controversy led to the appointment of a πρεσβύτερος ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας (presbyter for the repentant), in each of the Eastern churches,[7] and thus the system of penance was so rapidly developed, that as early as the end of the third century there were four grades of penances, like those through which the catechumens had to pass.[8] These were πρόσκλαυσις, ἀκρόασις, ὑπόπτω-

---

5 The words παραδοῦναι τῷ Σατανᾷ, 1 *Cor.* v. 5, 1 *Tim.* i. 20, were supposed to refer to excommunication. *Origenes in lib. Judic. hom.* II. § 5, *in Jerem. hom.* XVIII. § 14. *Selecta in Jer.* xxix. 4.

6 How far this readmission was supposed to secure the divine forgiveness may be seen from *Firmiliani Ep. ad Cypr.* (*Ep. Cypr.* 75): — Per singulos annos seniores et præpositi in unum convenimus, — ut si qua graviora sunt, communi consilio dirigantur, lapsis quoque fratribus et post lavacrum salutare a diabolo vulneratis per pœnitentiam medela quæratur: non quasi a nobis remissionem peccatorum consequantur, sed ut per nos ad intelligentiam delictorum suorum convertantur, et Domino plenius satisfacere cogantur. *Cyprian. de lapsis:* Nemo se fallat, nemo se decipiat. Solus Dominus misereri potest: veniam peccatis, quæ in ipsum commissa sunt, solus potest ille largiri, qui peccata nostra portavit. — Homo Deo esse non potest major; nec remittere aut donare indulgentia sua servus potest, quod in Dominum delicto graviore commissum est. — Dominus orandus est, Dominus nostra satisfactione placandus est, qui negantem negare se dixit, qui omne judicium de patre solus accepit. — Confiteantur singuli, quæso vos, fratres dilectissimi, delictum suum, dum adhuc qui deliquit in sæculo est, dum admitti confessio ejus potest, dum satisfactio et remissio facta per sacerdotes apud Dominum grata est. — Rogamus vos, ut pro vobis Deum rogare possimus. Preces ipsas ad vos prius vertimus, quibus Deum pro vobis, ut misereatur, oramus. (At a later period *Leo I.* about A. D. 450 *Ep.* 89: Sic divinæ bonitatis præsidia ordinata, ut indulgentia Dei nisi supplicationibus sacerdotum nequeat obtineri). Further *Cypriani Ep.* 52: Pignus vitæ in data pace percipiunt: — accepta pace commeatus a Deo datur. Comp. § 65, note 1. The reconciliation to the church was not an actus ordinis, but jurisdictionis, and could therefore be transferred from the bishop himself to a deacon. *Cypr. Ep.* 12, directs, ut qui libellos a martyribus acceperunt, et prærogativa eorum apud Deum adjuvari possunt (*Ep.* 13, et auxilio eorum adjuvari apud Dominum in delictis suis possunt), si incommodo aliquo et infirmitatis periculo occupati fuerint, non exspectata præsentia nostra, apud presbyterum quemcunque præsentem, vel si presbyter repertus non fuerit, et urgere exitus cœperit, apud diaconum quoque exomologesin facere delicti sui possint: ut manu eis in pœnitentiam imposita veniant ad Dominum cum pace, quam dari martyres litteris ad nos factis desideraverunt.

7 *Socrates hist. eccl.* V. c. 19: Ἀφ' οὗ Ναυατιανοὶ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας διεκρίθησαν, — οἱ Ἐπίσκοποι τῷ Ἐκκλησιαστικῷ κανόνι τὸν Πρεσβύτερον τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας προσέθεσαν, ὅπως ἂν οἱ μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα παίσαντες ἐπὶ τοῦ προβληθέντος τούτου πρεσβυτέρου ἐξομολογῶνται τὰ ἁμαρτήματα. cf. *Sozomenus* VII. c. 16.

8 *Cyprian* knows nothing of these grades. He sets forth the course to be pursued with the penitent, *Epist.* 11: Nam cum in minoribus delictis, quæ non in Deum committuntur, pœnitentia agatur justo tempore, et exomologesis fiat inspecta vita ejus qui agit pœnitentiam, nec ad communicationem venire quis possit, nisi prius illi ab episcopo et clero manus fuerit imposita: quanto magis in his gravissimis et extremis delictis caute omnia — observari oportet! The various grades (*Gregor. Thaumat. Epist. canonica can.* 11 being spurious, as is shown by *Morinus de pœn. lib.* VI. § 9, and taken from *Basilii epist.* 217, or *canonica* III. c. 75, vid. *Routh* reliqu. sacr. II. p. 458 seq.) are first mentioned *Conc. Ancyr.* c. 4. *Conc. Nicæn.* c. 11. *J. Morinus* de disciplina in administratione sacramenti pœnitentiæ. Paris. 1651. fol. *J. Dallæus* de sacramentali s.

σις, σύστασις (προσκλαίοντες, χειμάζοντες, *flentes, hiemantes,* — ἀκροώμενοι *audientes,* — γονυκλίνοντες, ὑποπίπτοντες, *genuflectentes, substrati,* — συνιστάμενοι *consistentes*). Such only were excommunicated as had been convicted of gross offences; others were only admonished by the elder brethren.[9]

Specimens of the church-discipline of this period are still existing in the Epistolæ canonicæ of *Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria,* of *Gregory Thaumaturgus* (both about the year 262), the canons of *Peter, bishop of Alexandria,* (from A. D. 306), and the canons of the council of *Illiberis* (A. D. 305?), *Arelate* (A. D. 314), *Ancyra* (A. D. 315), and *Neocæsarea* (A. D. 315).[10]

The penance usually extended through several years, and sometimes till death. For though in the Western church perpetual excommunication was now seldom resorted to in any case,[11] in Spain this

---

auriculari Latinorum confessione. Genev. 1661. 8vo. *Sam. Basnagii* Annales politico-eccles. T. II. p. 475. *Bingham,* lib. XVIII. in vol. VIII.

9 *Origenes in Psalm.* XXXVII. *hom.* II. § 6: Oportet peccatum non celare intrinsecus. Fortassis enim sicut ii, qui habent intus inclusam escam indigestam, aut humoris vel phlegmatis stomacho graviter et moleste immanentis abundantiam, si vomuerint, relevantur: ita etiam hi qui peccaverunt, si quidem occultant, et retinent intra se peccatum, intrinsecus urgentur, et propemodum suffocantur a phlegmate vel humore peccati: si autem ipse sui accusator fiat, dum accusat semetipsum et confitetur, simul evomit et delictum, atque omnem morbi digerit causam. Tantummodo circumspice diligentius, cui debeas confiteri peccatum tuum. Proba prius medicum, cui debeas causam languoris exponere, qui sciat infirmari cum infirmante, flere cum flente, qui condolendi et compatiendi noverit disciplinam: ut ita demum, si quid ille dixerit, qui se prius et eruditum medicum ostenderit et misericordem, si quid consilii dederit, facias, et sequaris, si intellexerit et præviderit, talem esse languorem tuum, qui in conventu totius Ecclesiæ exponi debeat et curari, ex quo fortassis et cæteri ædificari poterunt, et tu ipse facile sanari: multa hoc deliberatione, et satis perito medici illius consilio procurandum est. Of course, application was especially made to the clergy: hence *Origenes in Levit. hom.* II. § 4: Est — per pœnitentiam remissio peccatorum, cum lavat peccator in lacrymis stratum suum, — et cum non erubescit sacerdoti Domini indicare peccatum suum, et quærere medicinam. *In Levit. hom.* V. § 4: Discant sacerdotes Domini, qui Ecclesiis præsunt, quia pars eis data est cum his, quorum delicta repropitiaverint. Quid autem est repropitiare delictum? Si assumseris peccatorem, et monendo, hortando, docendo, instruendo adduxeris eum ad pœnitentiam, ab errore correxeris, a vitiis emendaveris, et effeceris eum talem, ut ei converso propitius fiat Deus pro delicto, repropitiasse diceris.

10 In the collection of Decrees of Councils, and in *Routh, reliqu. sacr. vol.* II-IV.

11 Comp. pp. 108, 126. The progress of the milder notions concerning the Lapsi after the Decian persecution is explained by *Cypriani Ep.* 52 *ad Antonianum:* Et quidem primum, quoniam de meo quoque actu motus videris, mea apud te et persona et causa purganda est, ne me aliquis existimet a proposito meo leviter recessisse, et cum evangelicum vigorem primo et inter initia defenderim, postmodum videar animum meum a disciplina et censura priore flexisse, ut his, qui libellis conscientiam suam maculaverint, vel nefanda sacrificia commiserint, laxandam pacem putaverim. Quod utrumque non sine librata diu et ponderata ratione a me factum est. Nam cum — prœlium gloriosi certaminis in persecutione ferveret, toto hortatu et pleno impetu militum vires fuerant excitandæ, et maxime lapsorum mentes — fortiter animandæ, ut pœnitentiæ viam non solum precibus et lamentationibus sequerentur, sed — ad confessionis

Montanistic rigor was not yet relaxed.[12] In Africa, on the other hand, during the persecution by Decius, the discipline of the church was in great danger of being wholly overthrown by the martyrs, who abused the right, which custom had conceded them, of readmitting the excommunicated to the church by their simple approval (*libellus pacis.*) [13]

---

potius ardorem et martyrii gloriam nostris increpiti vocibus provocarentur. — Secundum quod tamen ante fuerat destinatum, persecutione sopita, — copiosus Episcoporum numerus — in unum convenimus, et scripturis divinis ex utraque parte prolatis, temperamentum salubri moderatione libravimus, ut nec in totum spes communicationis et pacis lapsis denegaretur, ne plus desperatione deficerent, — nec tamen rursus censura evangelica solveretur, ut ad communicationem temere prosilirent; sed traheretur diu pœnitentia, et rogaretur dolenter paterna clementia, et examinarentur causæ et voluntates et necessitates singulorum. — Ac si minus sufficiens Episcoporum in Africa numerus videbitur, etiam Romam super hac re scripsimus ad Cornelium collegam nostrum; qui et ipse cum plurimis coëpiscopis habito concilio in eandem nobiscum sententiam pari gravitate et salubri moderatione consensit. — Nec putes, frater carissime, hinc aut virtutem fratrum minui aut martyria deficere, quod lapsis laxata sit pœnitentia, et quod pœnitentibus spes pacis oblata. — Nam et mœchis a nobis pœnitentiæ tempus conceditur et pax datur. (Comp. above p. 108 and 124, note 4). Non tamen iccirco virginitas in ecclesia deficit etc. — Miror autem quosdam sic obstinatos esse, ut dandam non putent lapsis pœnitentiam, aut pœnitentibus existiment veniam denegandam. cum scriptum sit: *Memento unde cecideris, et age pœnitentiam, et fac priora opera* (*Apoc.* ii. 5). After citing many similar passages: Quod legentes scilicet et tenentes neminem putamus a fructu satisfactionis et spe pacis arcendum, cum sciamus juxta scripturarum divinarum fidem, auctore et hortatore ipso Deo, et ad agendam pœnitentiam peccatores redigi, et veniam atque indulgentiam pœnitentibus non denegari. In the same mind the Council of Nice, c. 13, made it a universal rule of the church, ὥστε, εἴ τις ἐξοδεύοι, τοῦ τελευταίου καὶ ἀναγκαιοτάτου ἐφοδίου μὴ ἀποστερεῖσθαι.

12 Comp. Concil. Illiberit. see above, § 57, note 10. Thus too *Pacianus*, bishop of Barcelona about A. D. 370, in his *Paræneticus ad pœnitentiam* (*Bibl. PP. max. T. IV.*) says of the peccata capitalia: Reliqua peccata meliorum operum compensatione curantur. — Hæc quicunque post fidem fecerit, Dei faciem non videbit. cf. *Innocentii I. Epist.* 6 *ad Exsuperium Episc. Tolosanum* (A. D. 405) c. 2: Et hoc quæsitum est, quid de his observari oporteat, qui post baptismum omni tempore incontinentiæ voluptatibus dediti, in extremo fine vitæ suæ pœnitentiam simul et reconciliationem communionis exposcunt. De his observatio prior durior, posterior interveniente misericordia inclinatior. Nam consuetudo prior tenuit, ut concederetur pœnitentia, sed communio negaretur.

13 Comp. p. 109, note 35. *Dionysius Alex.* (ap. *Euseb. h. e.* VI. 42, 3, see § 72, note 7) thought himself obliged to allow this privilege to the martyrs; in Alexandria, indeed, they used it temperately. But Cyprian had great abuses to correct. See *Cyprian. epist.* 10, 11, 14, 29. *Epist. Luciani* (*Cyprian.* 21). — Cum benedictus martyr Paulus adhuc in corpore esset, vocavit me et dixit mihi: Luciane coram Christo dico tibi, ut si quis post arcessitionem meam abs te pacem petierit, da in nomine meo. *Epist.* 16: *Universi Confessores Cypriano Papæ Salutem!* Scias nos universis, de quibus apud te ratio constiterit, quid post commissum egerint, dedisse pacem, et hanc formam per te et aliis Episcopis innotescere voluimus. Optamus te cum sanctis Martyribus pacem habere. Præsente de Clero, et Exorcista et Lectore, Lucianus scripsit. — *Cyprian. epist.* 22 *ad Clerum Romanum:* Quæ res majorem nobis conflat invidiam, ut nos cum singulorum causas audire et excutere cœperimus, videamur multis negare, quod se nunc omnes jactant a Martyribus et Confessoribus accepisse. Denique hujus seditionis origo jam cœpit. Nam in provincia nostra per aliquot civitates in Præpositos impetos per multitudinem factus est, et pacem, quam semel cuncti a Martyribus et Confessoribus datam clamitabant, confestim sibi repræsentari

§ 69.

(Continuation). CONTROVERSIES CONCERNING POINTS OF CHURCH-DISCIPLINE.

1. *The schism of Felicissimus at Carthage.*[1] This was connected with the abuse just mentioned. Whilst Cyprian was absent in the persecution under Decius, several of the Presbyters began to readmit the Lapsi (§ 52, p. 109) on the strength of the *libelli pacis* of the martyrs, without farther question. Being reproved for this by Cyprian, a party was formed against him, at the head of which was the *Diaconus Felicissimus*, and many of the Confessors [vid. § 52, p. 109. — Tr.] in its ranks. This party refused all allegiance whatever to the fugitive bishop, and went on adding to its numbers by the reception of the Lapsi.[2] On the return of Cyprian (A. D. 251), they were all excommunicated; whereupon they chose Fortunatus for their bishop, but do not seem to have long survived.

2. *Novatian Schism.*[3] The Presbyter, Novatian, at Rome, was dissatisfied with the choice of the bishop Cornelius (A. D. 251), on account of his lenity towards the Lapsi. In the controversy which now ensued, Novatian, chiefly supported by the Presbyter, Novatus, of Carthage,[4] returned to the old principle, that those who had once

---

coëgerunt, territis et subactis Præpositis suis, qui ad resistendum minus virtute animi et robore fidei prævalebant. Apud nos etiam quidam turbulenti, qui vix a nobis in præteritum regebantur, et in nostram præsentiam differebantur, per hanc epistolam (*Confessorum Ep.* 16) velut quibusdam facibus accensi, plus exardescere, et pacem sibi datam extorquere cœperunt. Cyprian's opinion concerning the prerogatives of the martyrs (see *Epist.* 12, above, note 6) *Lib. de lapsis:* Credimus quidem posse apud judicem plurimum Martyrum merita et opera justorum: sed cum judicii dies venerit, cum post occasum sæculi hujus et mundi ante tribunal Christi populus ejus adstiterit. Cæterum si quis præpropera festinatione temerarius remissionem peccatorum dare se cunctis putat posse, aut audet Domini præcepta rescindere, non tantum nihil prodest, sed et obest lapsis. Provocasse est iram non servasse sententiam, nec misericordiam prius Dei deprecandam putare, sed contemto Domino de sua facultate præsumere. — Mandant martyres aliquid fieri, sed si justa, si licita; — ante est, ut sciamus illos de Deo impetrasse quod postulant, tunc facere quod mandant.

1 Sources: *Cypr. epist.* 38, 39, 40, 42, 55. Walch's Ketzerhist. Th. 2. S. 288 ff.

2 *Cypr. epist.* 40: Hi fomenta olim quibusdam confessoribus et hortamenta tribuebant, ne concordarent cum episcopo suo, ne ecclesiasticam disciplinam cum fide et quiete juxta præcepta dominica continerent etc. — nunc se ad lapsorum perniciem venenata sua deceptione verterunt, ut ægros et saucios — a medela vulneris sui avocent, et intermissis precibus et orationibus, quibus Dominus longa et continua satisfactione placandus est, ad exitiosam temeritatem mendacio captiosæ pacis invitent.

3 Sources: *Cyprian. epist.* 41 – 52. *Cornelii Rom. ep. ad Fabium Antioch.* (ap. Euseb. VI. 43), *Dionys. Alex. epist. ad Novatianum* (ibid. VI. 45), et *ad Dionysium Rom.* (ibid. VII. 8).

4 Of him Cyprian says, *Cypr. ep.* 49: Idem est Novatus, qui apud nos primum discordiæ et schismatis incendium seminavit, qui quosdam istic ex fratribus ab Episcopo segregavit. — Ipse est, qui Felicissimum, satellitem suum,

fallen from the faith could in no case be received again.[5] The church being divided by this schism, Novatian was chosen bishop by the one party, in opposition to Cornelius. Though the other bishops, and especially Cyprian at Carthage, and Dionysius at Alexandria, were on the side of Cornelius, great numbers in all parts joined the stricter party.[6] At first the Novatians contented themselves with opposing the return of the Lapsi to the church;[7] but afterwards adopted in its widest latitude the notion formerly entertained in Africa, that whoever should be found guilty of any gross sin after his baptism, must be for ever excluded from the church;[8] because the church would be itself tainted, if such an one were received again into its bosom. In accordance with this view, they considered themselves the only pure Christians, and required that all who joined them should be baptized anew.[9] This sect[10] was widely diffused and con-

---

Diaconum, nec permittente me, nec sciente, sua factione et ambitione constituit. In the earlier letters concerning the schism of Felicissimus, he does not speak of Novatus. There seems to be no reason to think that this last took any part in this schism; perhaps his former differences with Cyprian related to the encroachments of the bishops. To this may have been added dissatisfaction at his conduct in flying from persecution. It is not, therefore, necessary to assume with *Mosheim* de rebus Christ. ante C. M. p. 504, that Novatus had been an associate of Felicissimus and afterwards separated from him. Comp. *Mosheim, l. c.* p. 518. Walch's Ketzerhistorie, Th. 2. S. 293.

5 Novatian's notions on the subject had formerly been much more mild. *Epist. Cleri Rom. ad Cypr.* (*epist. Cypr.* 31). comp. *Cypr. epist.* 52.

6 Even *Fabius*, bishop of Antioch, was ὑποκατακλινόμενος τῷ σχίσματι Euseb. VI. 44), and at a Synod at Antioch τοῦ Νοουάτου κρατύνειν τινὲς ἐπεχείρουν τὸ σχίσμα, (l. c. 46). cf. *Socrat.* IV. 28.

7 Hence *Cyprianus, Ep.* 52, accuses Novatian of inconsistency: Aut si se cordis et renis scrutatorem constituit et judicem, per omnia æqualiter judicet, et — fraudatores et mœchos a latere atque a comitatu suo separet, quando multo et gravior et pejor sit mœchi quam libellatici causa. Novatian also calls on the Lapsi to do penance, *ibid.* O frustrandæ fraternitatis irrisio, O miserorum — caduca deceptio! — hortari ad satisfactionis pœnitentiam, et subtrahere de satisfactione medicinam: dicere fratribus nostris: *plange et lacrimas funde, et diebus ac noctibus ingemisce, et pro abluendo et purgando delicto tuo largiter et frequenter operare, sed extra ecclesiam post omnia ista morieris: quæcumque ad pacem pertinent facies, sed nullam pacem, quam quæris, accipies.* comp. note 8.

8 *Akesius*, a Novatian bishop, at the Council of Nice, says, (Socrat. I. 10): οὐ χρὴ τοὺς μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα ἡμαρτικότας ἁμαρτίαν, ἣν πρὸς θάνατον καλοῦσιν αἱ θεῖαι γραφαί, τῆς κοινωνίας τῶν θείων μυστηρίων ἀξιοῦσθαι· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ μετάνοιαν μὲν αὐτοὺς προτρέπειν, ἐλπίδα δὲ τῆς ἀφέσεως, μὴ σπρὰ τῶν ἱερέων, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκδέχεσθαι, τοῦ δυναμένου καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντος συγχωρεῖν ἁμαρτήματα. Comp: above, § 52, note 31, § 57, note 10.

9 Such also was the practice in the African church. So *Tertullian.* de baptismo 15, de præscr. 12, de pudicit. 19, as well as a council in *Carthage* under *Agrippinus* after A. D. 200, (Cypr. epist. 71, 73): so too *Can. Apost.* 45, 46. *Constitt. Apost.* VI. 15, and the two councils in *Iconium* in Asia Minor, (A. D. 235, see *Firmilian. in Epist. Cypr.* 75) and *Synnada.* cf. *Dionys. Alex.* ap. *Euseb.* VII. c. 7, § 3.

10 They were treated with great mildness by Constantine. *Cod. Theodos.* lib. XVI. Tit. 5, l. 2: Novatianos non adeo comperimus prædamnatos, ut iis, quæ petiverunt, crederemus minime largienda. Itaque ecclesiæ suæ domos, et loca sepulcris apta sine inquietudine eos firmiter possidere præcipimus, etc. (A. D.

tinued for many years. In Phrygia they united with the remnant of the Montanists.[11]

3. *Controversy concerning the baptism of Heretics.* The custom, common in Africa and Asia Minor, of baptizing reclaimed heretics had never been adopted at Rome, where it was considered sufficient for them to pass through the various *gradus pœnitentiæ;* and since the arrogant adoption of this custom by the Novatians, it seemed still more objectionable. Even in Africa there began now to be some doubt as to its propriety; though it was at length approved by two successive councils at Carthage (A. D. 255, 256). The latter of these councils having informed Stephen, bishop of Rome (A. D. 253–257), of their decision in a formal letter (Ep. Cypr. 72), received from him a haughty answer refusing to submit to it.[12] This led to a violent controversy between Stephen and Cyprian.[13] The former broke off all communion with the African churches; but this did not prevent their repeating the former decision in the most express terms at a third council held in Carthage (1 Sept. 256).[14] *Firmilianus*, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, assured them (Epist. Cypr. 75) of the entire assent of the churches in his province, accompanying his letter with bitter vituperations against Stephen;[15] whilst Dionysius,

---

326): as well as by the Council of Nice. Can. Nic. 8: καθαροὺς χειροθετουμένους μένειν οὕτως ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ.

11 Comp. especially *Socrates*, IV. 28. The Novatians in Phrygia forbade second marriages, (*ibid.* V. 22), and celebrated the Passover on the same day with the Quartodecimani.

12 It was *Cyprian's* principle (ep. 70): neminem foris baptizari extra Ecclesiam posse, cum sit baptisma unum in sancta Ecclesia constitutum. *Stephen* on the other hand (epist. 74): Si quis ergo a *quacunque hæresi* venerit ad vos, nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est, ut manus illi imponatur in pœnitentiam. — Qui in nomine Jesu Christi ubicunque et quomodocunque baptizantur, innovati et sanctificati judicentur. *Cyprian* again: In tantum Stephani fratris nostri obstinatio dura prorupit, ut etiam de Marcionis baptismo, item Valentini et Apelletis, et ceterorum blasphemantium in Deum patrem contendat filios Deo nasci.

13 The earlier letters of Cyprian on this affair are, *Ep.* 70–73. Notices of the controversy between him and Stephen may be found in *Cypr. Epist.* 74 *ad Pompejum*, and *Firmiliani Ep. ad Cypr.* (ep. Cypr. 75). *Cyprian*, speaking of *Stephen's* letter, says (Ep. 74): Cætera vel superba vel ad rem non pertinentia, vel sibi ipsi contraria, quæ imperite atque improvide scripsit etc. — Quæ ista obstinatio est, quæve præsumtio, humanam traditionem divinæ dispositioni anteponare, nec animadvertere, indignari et irasci Deum, quoties divina præcepta solvit et præterit humana traditio. — Nec consuetudo, quæ apud quosdam obrepserat, impedire debet, quominus veritas prævaleat et vincat. Nam consuetudo sine veritate vetustas erroris est. On the other hand (Ep. 75): non pudet Stephanum — Cyprianum pseudochristum et pseudoapostolum et dolosum operarium dicere. The consequences to be deduced from this controversy as to the supremacy afterwards claimed for the Pope are pointed out by *J. La Placette* observatt. historico-eccl., quibus eruitur veteris ecclesiæ sensus circa Pontif. Rom. potestatem in definiendis fidei rebus. Amsterd. 1695. 8vo. p. 102 seq.

14 The acts of this Council in *Augustini* de baptismo contra Donatistas lib. VI. et VII. — also in *Cypriani Opp.*

15 e. g. gratiam referre Stephano in isto possumus, quod per illius inhumanitatem nunc effectum sit, ut fidei et sapientiæ vestræ experimentum capere-

bishop of Alexandria, plainly condemns the course Stephen had pursued, if not his opinion.[16] After the death of Stephen and Cyprian, peace seems to have been at once restored, and on the disputed subject a middle opinion the prevailing one.[17]

4. *Meletian Schism.* During the persecution under Diocletian, *Meletius, bishop of Lycopolis,* maintained, that the Lapsi ought not to be admitted to penance till the persecution should have ceased. On this ground he withdrew from the authority of his metropolitan, *Peter of Alexandria* (A. D. 306), and assumed himself the Metropolitan office in the churches belonging to his party.[18] This schism lasted for more than a century.

5. *Donatian Schism.*[19] On occasion of the choice of *Cecilianus* to

---

mus. — Sed hæc interim, quæ a Stephano gesta sunt, prætereantur, ne dum audaciæ et insolentiæ ejus meminimus, de rebus ab eo improbe gestis longiorem mœstitiam nobis inferamus. — Atque ego in hac parte juste indignor ad hanc tam apertam et manifestam Stephani stultitiam, quod qui sic de Episcopatus sui loco gloriatur, et se successionem Petri tenere contendit, super quem fundamenta Ecclesiæ collocata sunt, multas alias petras inducat. — Lites et dissensiones quantas parasti (Stephane) per ecclesias totius mundi? Peccatum vero quam magnum tibi exaggerasti, quando te a tot gregibus scidisti? Exscidisti enim temet ipsum: noli te fallere. Siquidem ille est vere schismaticus, qui se a communione Ecclesiasticæ unitatis apostatam fecerit (as not of a Roman centro unitatis). Dum enim putas omnes a te abstinere posse, solum te ab omnibus abstinuisti, etc. This letter, the contents of which are so unpleasant to the Roman church (extant in 26 Codd.), was omitted in the edition of Cyprian. Romæ ap. Paul. Manutium. 1563. and first printed in that of Guil. Morellius. Paris. 1564. who is bitterly censured therefor by *Latinus Latinius* and *Pamelius. Christ. Lupus* (ad Tertull. libr. de præscr. Bruxell. 1675. 4to.) was the first who denied its authenticity. A Franciscan, *Raimund Missori* (In duas celeberr. epist. Firm. et Cypr. disputt. crit. Venet. 1733. 4to.) and the Jesuit *R. J. Tournemine* (mémoires de Trevoux de 1734. p. 2246 seq.) went still further, and declared Cyprian's letter concerning the baptism of heretics spurious. They were, however, answered by a member of their own church. *I. H. Sbaralea* germana S. Cypr. et Afrorum necnon Firmiliani opinio de hæreticorum baptism. Bonon. 1741. 4to. (Also in academical dissertations by *G. G. Preu.* Jenæ. 1738. and *D. Cotta.* Tub. 1740).

16 *Dion.* ep. ad Sixtum II. (successor of Stephanus, 258) ap. Euseb. VII. 5: ἐπιστέλλει (Στέφανος) μὲν οὖν πρότερον καὶ περὶ Ἑλένου καὶ περὶ Φιρμιλιανοῦ καὶ πάντων τῶν τε ἀπὸ τῆς Κιλικίας καὶ Καππαδοκίας καὶ Γαλατίας καὶ πάντων τῶν ἑξῆς ὁμοροούντων ἐθνῶν, ὡς οὐδὲ ἐκείνοις κοινωνήσων διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ταύτην αἰτίαν, ἐπειδὴ τοὺς αἱρετικούς, φησιν, ἀναβαπτίζουσι. Καὶ σκόπει τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ πράγματος. Ὄντως γὰρ δόγματα περὶ τούτου γέγονεν ἐν ταῖς μεγίσταις τῶν ἐπισκόπων συνόδοις, ὡς συνθάνομαι, ὥστε τοὺς προσιόντας ἀπὸ αἱρέσεων προκατηχηθέντας, εἶτα ἀπολούεσθαι καὶ ἀνακαθαίρεσθαι τὸν τῆς ταλαιᾶς καὶ ἀκαθάρτου ζύμης ῥύπον. Καὶ περὶ τούτων αὐτοῦ πάντων διέμενος, ἐπέστειλα. *Hieronymus catal.* c. 59.

17 *Can. Arelat.* 8: De Afris, quod propria lege sua utuntur, ut rebaptizent, placuit, ut si ad ecclesiam aliquis de hæresi venerit, interrogent eum symbolum; et si perviderint, eum in Patre, et Filio, et Spiritu Sancto esse baptizatum, manus ei tantum imponatur, ut accipiat Spiritum Sanctum. Quod si interrogatus non responderit hanc trinitatem, baptizetur.

18 Different accounts in *Epiphanius* hær. 68, on the one side, and *Athanasius* Apolog. ad Imp. Constant., *Socrates* I. 6, *Theodoretus* h. e. I. 8, on the other. Neand. II. 1. 463.

19 Sources: *Optatus* (bishop of Mileve, about A. D. 368) *de schismate Donatistarum* libb. VII. (VI.?) ed. *L. E. du Pin.* Paris. 1700. (in which edition also:

be bishop of Carthage (A. D. 311), the minority were so violently opposed to him, that they elected another bishop, Majorinus, on the ground that Cecilianus had been consecrated by a Traditor [vid. § 55, p. 118. — Tr.], *Felix, bishop of Aptunga. Majorinus* was soon succeeded (A. D. 313) by *Donatus*, called *the great*, from whom and *Donatus, bishop of Casæ nigræ*, one of its most zealous supporters, the party took its name. Their strictness in matters of church-discipline suited so well with the prevailing tendency in Africa, that their numbers fast increased, and at length they brought their cause before the Emperor Constantine, — the first instance of an appeal to the civil power in the affairs of the Christian church. Constantine at first intrusted Miltiades, bishop of Rome, and the Synod of his province, with the investigation of the affair (A. D. 313); and afterwards a special council was called for the purpose at *Arelate* (A. D. 314). In both instances the decision having been against the Donatists, they were condemned by the emperor, and severe laws passed against them (A. D. 316). This did not seem to diminish their numbers, however, and the sect long continued to exist.

§ 70.

PUBLIC WORSHIP.

In the third century the traces of houses devoted exclusively to Christian worship become more frequent and distinct;[1] and as early as the peaceful interval between the persecutions under Valerian and Diocletian there were large edifices erected for this purpose.[2] These were called *προσευκτήριον* (house of prayer), *κυριακόν*, *dominicum*, (house of the Lord), *οἶκος ἐκκλησίας* (house of the congregation), and also *ἐκκλησία*. From the time of Constantine they were also called *ναός*, *templum*, but never *fanum* or *delubrum*. In imitation of the temple at Jerusalem, the inner part of the church (called *ἁγίασμα*, *βῆμα*, *chorus*) was inaccessible to the common people; and here were kept the wooden table for the Lord's Supper (*τράπεζα*, *mensa sacra*),

---

Monumenta vetera ad Donatist. hist. pertinentia, and historia Donatistarum. *Augustine* in various works (all contained in the 19th part of the Benedictine edition, Appendix; also, Excerpta et scripta vetera ad Donatistarum historiam pertinentia) e. g. contra epistolam Parmeniani libb. 3, de baptismo libb. 7, contra literas Petiliani libb. 3, contra Cresconium libb. 4, breviculus collationum contra Donatistas libb. 3, etc. — Cf. *Valesius* de schismate Donatist. diss. (in edit. Euseb. Cantabr. p. 775), *Melchior Leydecker* historia eccles. Africanæ. Ultraj. 1690. 4to. p. 467. — Historia Donatistarum ex *Norisianis* schedis excerpta in H. Norisii opp. omn. ed. a *Petro et Hieron. fratribus Ballerinii*s (Veron. 1729, 1732. 4to. T. fol.) Tom. IV. Walch's Ketzergeschichte, Th. 4. S. 3 ff. — Neand. II. 2, 387.

1 Under *Alexander Severus* (§ 55, note 6), see there the works of *Cyprian, Dionysius Alex.* etc. comp. § 52, note 9.

2 *Euseb.* h. e. VIII. 1, 2: *μηδαμῶς ἔτι τοῖς παλαιοῖς οἰκοδομήμασιν ἀρκούμενοι, εὐρείας εἰς πλάτος ἀνὰ πάσας τὰς πόλεις ἐκ θεμελίων ἀνίστων ἐκκλησίας.*

and the seats of the clergy (*καθέδρα, θρόνοι*)[3]. Though the Christians were fond of having certain religious symbols on their ornaments and their domestic utensils,[4] nothing of the kind was suffered in the churches.[5]

In Origen's time the Christians had no general festivals, excepting the Sunday, the *Parasceve* (or preparation), the Passover, and the feast of Pentecost.[6] Soon after, however, the Christians in Egypt began to observe the festival of the *Epiphany*,[7] on the 6th of January, after the example of Basilides,[8] though, retaining the more orthodox view (vid. § 43, p. 85), they considered it the festival both of Christ's birth and of his baptism.

The honors paid to the martyrs were the same as in the second century, differing only in degree, not in kind, from those paid to all the honored dead. The yearly festivals held by the various churches at the graves of their martyrs,[9] were only an expression of the same feeling, which led them to assemble often in their burial-places (*κοιμητήριον, dormitorium*),[10] which were not unfrequently caves (*cryptæ*,

---

3 Comp. the description of the church in Tyre. *Euseb.* X. 4, 15 seq.

4 For example, on the signet-rings a dove, a ship, a lyre, an anchor, a fish, etc. Clem. Alex. Pædag. III. p. 289. *Tertullianus de pudicitia*, c. 7, speaks of the pictures on the caps representing the lost sheep sought for by the Lord Jesus and brought back on his shoulders, but seems (ch. 10) to disapprove of them. See Münters Sinnbilder der alten Christen. Heft 1. S. 7 ff.

5 *Can. Illiberit.* 36: Placuit, picturas in ecclesia non debere, ne quod colitur et adoratur, in parietibus depingatur. The older Catholic theologians, e. g. *Baronius*, *Bellarminus*, *Perronius*, etc. have attempted in various ways to evade the plain sense of this canon: though it has been honestly acknowledged, with all its historical consequences by *Petavius*, *Dogm. Theol.* Lib. XV. c. 13, no. 3. *Pagius* crit. ad ann. 55, no. 4, 18, and especially *Natalis Alexander* ad hist. eccl. sæc. III. Diss. 21. *Art.* 2.

6 *Origen. contra Cels.* VIII. p. 392. To these the festival of the Ascension seems soon after to have been added (first mentioned *Constitt. Apostol.* V. 19; and by *Augustine Ep.* 118 *ad Januar.* — spoken of as already long established. See Krabbe über die apostol. Constitutionen, S. 176 ff). [The *Parisceve* was the *Preparation* for the Sunday, and consisted in fasting and prayer, being observed on Wednesday and Friday, the latter particularly. See Neander's Hist. of the Church. Vol. I. p. 337 seq. Lond. 1831. — Tr.]

7 *ἡ ἐπιφάνεια* is apparitio *τοῦ λόγου, τὰ ἐπιφάνια* festum apparitionis.

8 Comp. § 43, note 2. So also *Jablonski* de orig. festi nativ. Christi diss. I. § 7. (Opusc. ed. *te Water* III. p. 328 seq.) Differently Neander Gnost. Systeme, S. 49, 81, und Kirchengesch. Bd. 1. Abth. 2. S. 527 f. Answered in Hallische A. L. Z. April, 1823. S. 836. [Neander's Church Hist. Vol. I. p. 346. Lond. 1831. 8vo. — Tr.]

9 Comp. above p. 109. Remarkable passage of Gregory Thaumaturgus, see *Vita S. Gregorii Thaumat. per Gregor. Nyssenum* (ed. G. Vossii, p. 312): *Συνιδὼν ὅτι ταῖς σωματικαῖς θυμηδίαις τῇ περὶ τὰ εἴδωλα πλάνῃ παραμένει τὸ ἡπιώδες τῶν πολλῶν καὶ ἀπαίδευτον· ὡς ἂν τὸ προηγούμενον τίως ἐν αὐτοῖς μάλιστα καταρθωθείη τὸ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, ἀντὶ τῶν ματαίων σεβασμάτων βλέπειν, ἐφῆκεν αὐτοῖς ταῖς τῶν ἁγίων μαρτύρων ἐμφαιδρύνεσθαι μνήμαις καὶ εὐπαθεῖν καὶ ἀγάλλεσθαι.*

10 Hence *Æmilianus*, governor of Egypt in the Valerian persecution, says to the Christians who had been led before him (*Dionys. Alex.* ap. *Euseb.* VII. 11, 4): *οὐδαμῶς δὲ ἐξέσται ὑμῖν — ἢ συνόδους ποιεῖσθαι ἢ εἰς τὰ καλούμενα κοιμητήρια εἰσιέναι.* So also the proconsul of Africa (*Acta proconsularia S. Cypriani*, c. 1).

catacumbæ),[11] and therefore peculiarly convenient in times of persecution. At the celebration of the Lord's Supper all those, who had presented offerings on that particular occasion, were remembered in the prayers of the church. The last almost always included the name of some martyr; to present offerings at the Eucharist in their name, especially on the anniversary of their death, being a common mode of showing them honor.[12]

§ 71.

OF CELIBACY AND OTHER ASCETIC PRACTICES.

We still find in the church a deep sense of Christian freedom, as was seen especially in the beginning of this period, in the opposition to the ascetic rigor of the Montanists.[1] Fasting was en-

---

Gallienus annulled this rule (vid. § 55, note 14), though it was afterwards renewed by Maximin (*Euseb.* IX. c. 2).

11 On the Roman catacombs *Hieronymus in Ezechiel.* c. 40: Dum essem Romæ puer, et liberalibus studiis erudirer, solebam cum cæteris ejusdem ætatis et propositi diebus dominicis sepulchra Apostolorum et Martyrum circuire: crebroque cryptas ingredi, quæ in terrarum profunda defossæ, ex utraque parte ingredientium per parietes habent corpora sepulturarum, et ita obscura sunt omnia, ut propemodum illud propheticum compleatur: *descendant ad infernum viventes*, etc. cf. *Prudentius περὶ στεφ. hymn.* XI. *Passio Hippolyti*, v. 153 seq. — Modern descriptions of the catacombs of Rome, *Pauli Aringhi* Roma subterranea novissima, and others. Paris. 1659. 2 voll. fol. *M. A. Boldetti* osservazioni sopra i Cimiteri de' SS. Martiri, ed antichi Cristiani di Roma. 1720. 2 T. fol. see further the works of *Bottari*, *Ciampini*, etc. (vid. Münters Sinnbilder d. alten Christen. Heft 1. S. 24). Volkmanns histor. krit. Nachrichten v. Italien (Leipz. 3 Bde. 1777), Bd. 3. S. 67 ff: on those at Naples, *Pellicin* de Christ. eccl. politia. Tom. III. P. II. Diss. 5: on those in Sicily, vid. Bartels Briefe über Calabrien und Sicilien (Götting. 3 Th. 1787–91), Th. 3. S. 203. Münters Nachrichten v. Neapel und Sicilien, S. 344. — That the Roman catacombs were not exclusively devoted to the burial of martyrs is shown by *Eusebii Romani* (Mabillon) ad Theophilum Gallum epistola de cultu Sanctorum ignotorum. Paris. 1688. 4to. In the 2d edition, 1705, he is, however, obliged to yield.

12 The list of names to be thus mentioned, as it was not always the same, was inscribed for each occasion on the tables (diptycha) and afterwards erased. Hence the word *diptycha* was used to designate the list of names to be mentioned in the prayers at the communion service, though these lists afterwards assumed a more permanent character. The names *diptycha, diptycha Episcoporum, dipt. vivorum* first occur in the fifth century Vid. *Cyprian.* ep. 66.

1 *Tertull. de jejuniis* 2: Certe in evangelio illos dies jejuniis determinatos putant (Psychici), in quibus ablatus est sponsus, et hos esse jam solos legitimos jejuniorum Christianorum, abolitis legalibus et propheticis vetustatibus. — Itaque de cætero indifferenter jejunandum, ex arbitrio, non ex imperio novæ disciplinæ, pro temporibus et causis uniuscujusque. Sic et Apostolos observasse, nullum aliud imponentes jugum certorum et in commune omnibus obeundorum jejuniorum: proinde nec stationum, quæ et ipsæ suos quidem dies habeant, quartæ feriæ et sextæ, passive tamen currant, neque sub lege præcepti, — cum fides libera in Christo ne Judaicæ quidem legi abstinentiam quorundam ciborum debeat, semel in totum macellum ab Apostolo admissa, detestatore eorum, qui sicut nubere prohibeant, ita jubeant cibis abstinere a Deo conditis: et ideo nos esse jam tunc prænotatos *in novissimis temporibus abscedentes a fide, intendentes*

tirely a matter of choice, except that the custom of the church had made certain days more appropriate for that purpose, which, however, were very different in different regions.[2] On particular occasions, also, the churches were summoned by their bishops to a general fast.[3] Fasts were likewise imposed as acts of penance.[4] As to celibacy, views so rational as we find in the writings of Clement of Alexandria were probably rare;[5] it being for the most part considered a state more pure and holy than wedlock.[6] Hence

---

spiritibus mundi seductoribus, doctrinis mendaciloquorum inustam habentes conscientiam, (1 Tim. iv. 1, 2). — Sic et cum Galatis nos quoque percuti ajunt *observatores dierum et mensium et annorum* (Gal. iv. 10. cf. c. xiv.: *galaticamur* plane.) Jaculantur interea et Esaiam pronunciasse: *non tale jejunium Dominus elegit,* id est, non abstinentiam cibi, *sed opera justitiæ,* quæ subtexit (Es. lviii. 5, 6.). Et ipsum Dominum in Evangelio ad omnem circa victum scrupulositatem compendio respondisse, non his coinquinari hominem, quæ in os inferantur, sed quæ ex ore proferantur, cum et ipse manducaret et biberet usque in notationem: *Ecce homo vorator et potator* (Matth. xi. 19.). Sic et Apostolum docere, quod *esca nos Deo non commendet: neque abundantes, si edamus, neque deficientes, si non edamus* (1 Cor. viii. 8,). Comp. Neanders Antignosticus, S. 279 ff.

2 *Origenes hom.* X. *in Levitic.* § 2: Habemus enim quadragesimæ dies jejuniis consecratos. Habemus quartam et sextam septimanæ dies, quibus solemniter jejunamus. Is this translation of Rufinus correct? cf. *Dionys. epist. can. ad Basilid. can.* 1: μηδὲ τὰς ἓξ τῶν νηστειῶν ἡμέρας ἴσως, μηδὲ ὁμοίως πάντες διαμένουσιν· ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν καὶ πάσας ὑστεριθίασιν (i. e. fast many days successively. Concerning this word ὑστερθίσεις, superpositions, see *Bingham*, vol. IX. p. 229. *Routh. reliqu. sacr.* II. p. 410.) ἄσιτοι διατελοῦντες, οἱ δὲ δύο, οἱ δὲ τρεῖς, οἱ δὲ τέσσαρας, οἱ δὲ οὐδεμίαν. — εἰ δέ τινες οὐχ ὅπως οὐχ ὑπερτιθέμενοι, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ νηστεύσαντες ἢ καὶ τροφήσαντες τὰς προκούσας τέσσαρας, εἶτα ἐλθοντες ἐπὶ τὰς τελευταίας δύο καὶ μόνας ἡμέρας, αὐτὰς ὑστεριθέντες, τήν τε παρασκευὴν καὶ τὸ σάββατον, μέγα τι καὶ λαμπρὸν ποιεῖν νομίζουσιν, ἂν μέχρι τῆς ἕω διαμείνωσιν, τούτους οὐκ οἶμαι τὴν ἴσην ἀθλησιν πιστοῦσθαι τοῖς τὰς πλείονας ἡμέρας προσεσκηκόσι. *Const. Apost.* V. 17: ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις οὖν τοῦ Πάσχα νηστεύετε ἀρχόμενοι ἀπὸ δευτέρας μέχρι τῆς παρασκευῆς καὶ σαββάτου ἓξ ἡμέρας, κ. τ. λ.

3 *Tertull. de jejun.* c. 13. Comp. § 52. note 28. The ambition of the bishops was sometimes seen even in this. *Origenes in Matth. commentariorum series* § 10: Qui docent etiam abstinere a cibis, et alia hujusmodi, ad quæ non omnino oportet cogere homines fideles, alligant per verbum expositionis suæ onera gravia, citra voluntatem Christi dicentis: *Iugum meum suave est, et onus meum leve est:* et imponunt ea, quantum ad verbum suum, super humeros hominum, curvantes eos, et cadere facientes sub pondere gravium mandatorum eos, qui bajulare eam non sufferunt. Et frequenter videre est, eos qui talia docent, contraria agere sermonibus suis, etc.

4 Sometimes, as it would seem, of forty days, in imitation of Jesus. *Petri Alex.* can. 1.

5 *Clem. Alex. Strom.* VII. p. 874: διὸ καὶ ἰσθίει καὶ πίνει καὶ γαμεῖ (ὁ γνωστικὸς), οὐ προηγουμένως ἀλλὰ ἀναγκαίως. τὸ γαμεῖν δὲ, ἐὰν ὁ λόγος ἔῃ, λέγω, καὶ ὡς καθήκει. Γενόμενος γὰρ τέλειος (maritus) εἰκόνας ἔχει τοὺς Ἀποστόλους, καὶ τῷ ὄντι ἀνὴρ οὐκ ἐν τῷ μονήρει ἐπαγγελεῖσθαι δείκνυται βίον, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνος ἄνδρας νικᾷ, ὁ γάμῳ καὶ παιδοποιΐᾳ, καὶ τῇ τοῦ οἴκου προνοίᾳ ἀνηδόνως τε καὶ ἀλυπήτως ἐγγυμνασάμενος, μετὰ τῆς τοῦ οἴκου κηδεμονίας ἀδιάστατος τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ γενόμενος ἀγάπης, καὶ πάσης κατεξανισταμένος πείρας, τῆς διὰ τέκνων καὶ γυναικὸς, οἰκετῶν τε καὶ κτημάτων προσφερομένης. Τῷ δὲ ἀοίκῳ τὰ πολλὰ εἶναι συμβέβηκεν ἀπειράστῳ. cf. lib. III. p. 546, etc.

6 e. g. *Cyprianus de habitu Virginum:* Nunc nobis ad virgines sermo est, quarum quo sublimior gloria est, major et cura est. Flos est ille ecclesiastici germinis, decus atque ornamentum gratiæ spiritalis, læta indoles, laudis et

many of both sexes * bound themselves to observe it, though their vows do not seem to have been irrevocable.[7] This high estimation of celibacy did not as yet, however, lead to the entire prohibition of marriage among the clergy; though they had long been forbidden to marry a second time (vid. § 52), and now were no longer allowed to marry at all after their ordination.[8] They were not obliged, however, to put away their wives if they had been married before, provided they had married neither a widow, nor a divorced person, nor a harlot, nor a slave, nor an actress.[9] Amongst the unmarried clergy the dangerous practice was introduced of taking to themselves virgins with whom they professed to live in pure, intellectual communion.

---

honoris opus integrum atque incorruptum, Dei imago respondens ad sanctimoniam Domini: illustrior portio gregis Christi. *Euseb. Demonstrat. Evang.* I. c. 8: οἱ μαθηταὶ (τοῦ Χριστοῦ) — ὅσα μὲν ἅτε τὴν ἕξιν διαβεβηκόσι πρὸς τοῦ τελείου διδασκάλου παρήγγελτο, ταῦτα τοῖς οἵαις τε χωρεῖν παρεδίδουν· ὅσα δὲ τοῖς ἔτι τὰς ψυχὰς ἐμπαθέσι, καὶ θεραπείας δεομένοις ἐφαρμόζειν ὑπελάμβανον, ταῦτα συγκατιόντες τῇ τῶν πλειόνων ἀσθενείᾳ — φυλάττειν παρεδίδοσαν· ὥστε ἤδη καὶ τῇ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίᾳ δύο βίων νενομοθετῆσθαι τρόπους· τὸν μὲν ὑπερφυῆ, καὶ τῆς κοινῆς καὶ ἀνθρωπίνης πολιτείας ἐπίκεινα, οὐ γάμους, οὐ παιδοποιΐας, οὐδὲ κτῆσιν, οὐδὲ περιουσίας ὑπαρξιν παραδεχόμενον, ἅλον δὲ δι' ὅλου τῆς καινῆς καὶ συνήθους ἁπάντων ἀνθρώπων ἀγωγῆς παρηλλαγμένον, καὶ μόνῃ τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ θεραπείᾳ προσκεκολλημένον καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἔρωτος οὐρανίου. Οἱ δὴ τόνδε μετιόντες τὸν τρόπον, τῶν θνητῶν βίον τεθνάναι δοκοῦντες, καὶ αὐτὸ μόνον τὸ σῶμα φέροντες ἐπὶ γῆς, φρονήματι δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν εἰς οὐρανὸν μετενηνεγμένοι, οἷός τινες θεοί, τὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐφορῶσι βίον, ὑπὲρ τοῦ παντὸς γένους ἱερωμένοι τῷ ἐπὶ πάντων θεῷ, οὐ βουθυσίαις καὶ αἵμασιν, — δόγμασι δὲ ὁρθοῖς ἀληθοῦς εὐσεβείας, ψυχῆς τε διαθέσει κεκαθαρμένης, καὶ προσίτι τοῖς κατ' ἀρετὴν ἔργοις τε καὶ λόγοις. οἷς τὸ θεῖον ἐξιλεούμενοι, τὴν ὑπὲρ σῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν σφίσιν ὁμογενῶν ἀποτελοῦσιν ἱερουργίαν. Τοιόσδε μὲν οὖν καθέστηκεν ὁ ἐντελὴς τῆς κατὰ τὸν χριστιανισμὸν πολιτείας τρόπος. Ὁ δ' ὑποβεβηκὼς ἀνθρωπινώτερος, οἷος καὶ γάμοις συγκατιέναι σώφροσι καὶ παιδοποιΐαις, κ. τ. λ. — Καί τις τούτοις δεύτερος εὐσεβείας ἀπενεμήθε βαθμός, κ. τ. λ.

* Cf. *Cyprianus* de habitu Virginum; *Methodii* convivium decem Virginum (in Combesii auctarium novissimum bibl. Græcor. Patrum, P. I. p. 64 seq.), and the two spurious letters attributed to Clem. Rom., written probably about this time, first made known in the Syriac by Wetstein, N. T. T. II.

7 *Cypriani epist.* 62: Quod si (virgines) ex fide se Christo dicaverunt, pudicæ et castæ sine ulla fabula perseverent, et ita fortes et stabiles prœmium virginitatis exspectent. *Si autem perseverare nolunt, vel non possunt, melius est ut nubant, quam in ignem delictis suis cadant.* Certe nullum fratribus aut sororibus scandalum faciant, etc. *Concil. Illiberit.* can. 13, relates to the licentious conduct of those, quæ se Deo dicaverint, and therefore is not to the purpose. See, however, *Conc. Ancyran.* can. 19: Ὅσοι παρθενίαν ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, ἀθέτουσι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, τὸν τῶν διγάμων ὅρον ἐκπληρούτωσαν. According to *Basilii Ep. can.* IV., the punishment of bigamy was a penance of one year.

8 First the *Canon Ancyr.* X: Διάκονοι, ὅσοι καθίστανται, παρ' αὐτὴν τὴν κατάστασιν εἰ ἐμαρτύραντο καὶ ἔφασαν χρῆναι γαμῆσαι, μὴ δυνάμενοι οὕτως μένειν· οὗτοι μετὰ ταῦτα γαμήσαντες, ἑστῶσαν ἐν τῇ ὑπηρεσίᾳ, διὰ τὸ ἐπιστρατῆναι αὐτοὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου. Τοῦτο δὲ εἴ τινες σιωπήσαντες, καὶ καταδεξάμενοι ἐν τῇ χειροτονίᾳ μένειν οὕτως, μετὰ ταῦτα ἦλθον ἐπὶ γάμον, σιπαῦσθαι αὐτοὺς τῆς διακονίας. *Can. Neocæsar.* 1: Πρεσβύτερος ἐὰν γήμῃ, τῆς τάξεως αὐτὸν μετατίθεσθαι. For instances of married bishops and presbyters, vid. *Culirt.* de conjugio cleri orum, ed. *Henke*, p. 201 seq.

9 Can. Apost. 17: Ὁ χήραν λαβὼν, ἢ ἐκβεβλημένην, ἢ ἑταίραν, ἢ οἰκέτιν, ἢ τῶν ἐπὶ σκηνῆς, οὐ δύναται εἶναι ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος ἢ διάκονος, ἢ ὅλως τοῦ καταλόγου τοῦ ἱερατικοῦ, according to 3 Mosheim, 21, 14.

These young women they called *ἀδελφαὶ, sorores,* (sisters,)[10] though others called them *συνείσακτοι,*[11] *subintroductæ* (the taken home), *ἀγαπηταὶ,* (the well-beloved,) *extraneæ.* This practice was denounced by Cyprian, and after him by several Synods ;[12] at some of which all extraordinary ascetic practices of the clergy were forbidden.[13]

Hitherto the Ascetics had lived in the midst of other Christians, undistinguished but by their peculiar habits ; but during the persecution under Decius some of the Egyptian Christians,[14] having taken refuge in the deserts, adopted there a life of the most extravagant self-denial and ascetic rigor (*ἐρημῖται, μοναχοί*). Here they remained almost unknown, until, during the persecution under Maximinus (A. D. 311), one of them, named *Antony,* appeared in strange and wild attire at Alexandria. A season of persecution was peculiarly favorable to this kind of extravagance, and Antony found many followers ; so as in the sequel to be considered the father of *Monachism.*[15]

---

10 The first traces of this custom are amongst the Gnostics. *Irenæus* I, 1. § 12. says of certain Valentinians : *ὡς μετὰ ἀδελφῶν προσποιούμενοι συνοικεῖν, προϊόντος τοῦ χρόνου ἠλέγχθησαν, ἐγκύμονος τῆς ἀδελφῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ γενηθείσης.* Perhaps also Marcion vid. Hall. All. Lit. Zeit. April, 1823, S. 850. The Catholics seem first to have been accused of this by *Tertullianus de jejuniis* c. 17 : Apud te agape in cacabis fervet, fides in culinis calet, spes in ferculis jacet. Sed major his est agape, quia per hanc adolescentes tui cum sororibus dormiunt (Play upon 1 Cor. xiii. 13.). From the time of Cyprian the thing occurs more frequently, see note 12. Such ascetics appealed to the example of Jesus, John, and the Apostles, (*Lib. de singularit. cleric.* c. 20. *Epiphan. hær.* 78. c. 11), and named the young women according to 1 Cor. ix. 5, *Sorores. (Conc. Ancyr.* c. 19. *Theodos.* XVI. 2, 44). Comp. *Observationum selectarum ad rem literariam spectantium, Tom.* VI. *(Halæ.* 1702) p. 230 seq. *Dodwell diss. Cyprian.* III. *L. A. Muratori Anecdota græca,* p. 218 seq.

11 *Euseb.* VII, 30, 6 : *τὰς συνεισάκτους γυναῖκας, ὡς Ἀντιοχεῖς ὀνομάζουσι.* A witticism suggested, perhaps, by the term *περιακτοῖ* 1 Cor. ix. 5. (cf. Ammian. Marcell. 22, 14.), perhaps taken from John xix. 27. *ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν εἰς τὰ ἴδια* i. e. *συνεισήγαγεν.*

12 *Cyprian.* Epist. 5, 6. especially 62. *Can. Illib.* 27, *Ancyr.* 19, *Nicæn* 3. — The later work de singularitate clericorum, in opp. Cypriani, is directed entirely against this practice.

13 *Can. Ancyr.* 14, *Can. Illiber.* 33 : Placuit in totum prohiberi episcopis, presbyteris et diaconibus vel omnibus clericis positis in ministerio, abstinere se a conjugibus suis, et non generare filios : quicunque vero fecerit, ab honore clericatus exterminetur. The title afterwards added to the canon *(De episcopis et ministris, ut ab uxoribus se abstineant)* has led some to give it a sense precisely the contrary to what is meant, which is the same with *Canon. Apostol.* 5 : *Ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος ἢ διάκονος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα μὴ ἐκβαλλέτω προφάσει εὐλαβείας. Ἐὰν δὲ ἐκβάλλῃ, ἀφορίζέσθω · ἐπιμένων δὲ, καθαιρείσθω.*

14 Comp. *Dionys. Alex.* ap. Euseb. h. e. VI. 42.

15 *Sozomenus* h. e. I. 12, 13 : Vita Antonii by Athanasius (either spurious or much interpolated ; vid. *Oudini* comm. de scriptor. eccles. ant. vol. 1. p. 358.)

§ 72.

MORAL CHARACTER OF CHRISTIANITY IN THIS PERIOD.

Though Christian freedom was as yet but little fettered by ecclesiastical laws, and the essentials of Christianity, for the most part, were rightly distinguished from its forms, we may still see, even in this period, the germs of that moral corruption, which soon pervaded the Christian world. The prevailing notion of the church as a visible association led men to set too high a value on mere conformity to its dogmas,[1] and reception within its pale.[2] To this was added the error of estimating both virtues and vices too much according to external circumstances. The church was, perhaps, necessarily guided by these in adjudging its punishments;[3] and it was natural, therefore, that men should adopt this standard in judging of sins, rather than set up a high one of their own.

On the other hand, an ascetic life was altogether too highly esteemed, and in particular the endurance of persecution in the cause of Christianity.[4] Although the motives of many martyrs were at the least suspicious,[5] and many of the Confessors were known to be immoral men,[6] yet was it the general opinion, that, by the tortures which they underwent, they not only blotted out their own sins before God, but even atoned for the sins of others.[7] The notion that the prayers

---

1 *Origines in Matth. commentar. series* § 33: Et malum quidem est, invenire aliquem secundum mores vitæ errantem, multo autem pejus arbitror esse in dogmatibus aberrare et non secundum verissimam regulam scripturarum sentire. Quoniam sicut in peccatis mortalibus, puniendi sumus amplius propter dogma falsa peccantes.

2 *Orig. selecta in Job.* ed. de la Rue, p. 501: *καὶ ὁ αἱρετικὸς ὅταν εὔξηται — ὅταν δοκῇ καπιστηρίχθαι, τότε εἰς τέλος ἀπολεῖται· ἡ γὰρ εὐχὴ αὐτοῦ λογίζεται αὐτῷ εἰς ἁμαρτίαν. Cyprian. de unit. eccles.*: Tales etiamsi occisi in confessione nominis fuerint, macula ista nec sanguine abluitur. — Esse martyr non potest, qui in ecclesia non est. Heretics were considered as of course the most corrupt of men. Hence the distorted descriptions of them.

3 Comp. especially the *Canones Illiberitani*, De Wettes Geschichte der christl. Sittenlehre. Erste Hälfte, S. 176 ff.

4 De Wette l. c. S. 184 ff.

5 *Clem. Strom.* VII. p. 871: *οἱ μὲν γὰρ φιλοδοξίᾳ (ἐμμένουσιν ὁμολογίᾳ), οἱ δὲ εὐλαβείᾳ κολάσεως ἄλλης δριμυτέρας, οἱ δὲ διά τινας ἡδονὰς καὶ εὐφροσύνας τὰς μετὰ θάνατον ὑπομένοντες, παῖδες ἐν πίστει.* Comp. Tertullian's reproaches above, § 52, note 34.

6 *Cyprian. de unit. eccl.*: Ceterum numquam in confessoribus fraudes et stupra et adulteria postmodum viderimus, quæ nunc in quibusdam videntes ingemiscimus et dolemus. *Epist.* 6. *ad Rogatianum presb. et cæteros confessores:* Cum quanto enim nominis vestri pudore delinquitur, quando aliquis temulentus et lasciviens demoratur, alius in eam patriam, unde extorris factus est, regreditur, ut apprehensus non jam quasi Christianus sed quasi nocens pereat? cf. *Epist.* 5.

7 Tertullian resists this notion strenuously, *de pudicitia* c. 22, in reference more directly to the Confessors: Quis enim in terris et in carne sine culpa, quis martyr seculi incola, etc.? And even in ipsa securitate et possessione martyrii, quis permittit homini donare quæ Deo reservanda sunt? — Sufficiat martyri propria delicta purgasse. Ingrati vel superbi est in alios quoque spargere, quod pro

of the dead availed for the living, was already prevalent,[8] especially in the school of Origen,[9] but had not yet sufficient authority to influence directly the mode of honoring the martyrs. The fanatical self-devotion to martyrdom (*profiteri*) was by many still held in high esteem,[10] though, for the most part, it was condemned.[11]

---

magno fuerit consecutus. On the other hand, *Cyprianus Ep.* 12 and 13, acknowledges Christianos auxilio Martyrum adjuvari apud Dominum in delictis suis posse (see above § 68, note 6. comp. § 68. note 13. the passage ex *Lib. de lapsis*). As to the manner in which this influence was exerted, there were various views. *Origenes exhort. ad martyr. c.* 50 *ed. de la Rue, T. I. p.* 309: Τάχα δὲ καὶ ὥσπερ τιμίῳ αἵματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἠγοράσθημεν, — οὕτως τῷ τιμίῳ αἵματι τῶν μαρτύρων ἀγορασθήσονταί τινες. cf. *in Numer. Hom.* 24. *T. II. p.* 362. On the other hand *Dionys. Alex. ap. Euseb. h. c. VI.* 42, 3: οἱ θεῖοι μάρτυρες — οἱ νῦν τοῦ Χριστοῦ πάρεδροι καὶ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ κοινωνοί, καὶ μέτοχοι τῆς κρίσεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ συνδικάζοντες αὐτῷ, τῶν παραπεπτωκότων ἀδελφῶν — τὴν ἐπιστροφὴν καὶ μετάνοιαν ἰδόντες, δεκτὴν τε γενέσθαι δυναμένην τῷ θεῷ — δοκιμάσαντες, εἰσιδίξαντο. — τί ἡμῖν πρακτέον; — τὴν κρίσιν αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν χάριν φυλάξωμεν; — ἢ τὴν κρίσιν αὐτῶν ἄδεκτον ποιησώμεθα, καὶ δοκιμαστὰς αὐτοὺς τῆς ἐκείνων γνώμης ἐπιστήσωμεν; Cyprian writes to certain confessors, *Ep* 15: Vox illa purificatione confessionis illustris — impetrat de domini bonitate quod postulat; and *Ep.* 77: nunc vobis in precibus efficacior sermo est, et ad impetrandum quod in pressuris petitur facilior oratio est: in the *Lib. de lapsis*, however, (above § 68, note 13.), he limits their reconciling influence to the *dies judicii.*

8 *Cypriani Epist.* 57 *ad Cornelium:* Memores nostri invicem simus, — utrobique pro nobis semper oremus, — et si quis istinc nostrum prior divinæ dignationis celeritate præcesseriit; perseveret apud Dominum nostra dilectio, pro fratribus et sororibus nostris apud misericordiam patris non cesset oratio.

9 *Origenes in Cant. Cant. lib. III. ed. de la Rue,* T. III. p. 75: Sed et omnes sancti, qui de hac vita decesserunt, habentes adhuc charitatem erga eos qui in hoc mundo sunt, si dicantur curam gerere salutis eorum, et juvare eos precibus suis atque interventu suo apud Deum, *non erit inconveniens.* — *Idem in libr. Jesu Nave hom.* 16 § 5 (T. II. p. 437): Ego sic arbitror, quod omnes illi, qui dormierunt ante nos, patres pugnent nobiscum et adjuvent nos orationibus suis. Ita namque etiam quemdam de senioribus magistris audivi dicentem in eo loco, in quo scriptum est in *Numeris* (xxii. 4), quia *ablinget synagoga illa hanc synagogam, sicut ablingit vitulus herbam viridem in campo.* Dicebat ergo: Quare hujusmodi similitudo assumta est, nisi quia hoc est, quod intelligendum est in hoc loco, quod synagoga Domini, quæ nos præcessit in sanctis, ore et lingua consumit adversariam synagogam, i. e. orationibus et precibus adversarios nostros absumit? — *Idem. in Epist. ad Rom. Lib. II. p.* 479: Jam vero si etiam extra corpus positi vel sancti, qui cum Christo sunt, agunt aliquid, et laborant pro nobis ad similitudinem Angelorum, qui salutis nostræ ministeria procurant: vel rursum peccatores etiam ipsi extra corpus positi agunt aliquid secundum propositum mentis suæ, ad Angelorum nihilominus similitudinem sinistrorum, cum quibus et in æternum ignem mittendi dicuntur a Christo: *habeatur et hoc quoque inter occulta Dei, nec chartulæ committenda mysteria.* Origen's follower, *Eusebius præp. Evang. XII. c.* 3, begins with referring to *Plato de Legg. lib. XI.*, and then proceeds: Καὶ ἐν τῷ βίβλῳ δὲ τῶν Μακκαβαίων (2 Macc. xv. 14.) λέγεται Ἱερεμίας ὁ προφήτης, μετὰ τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν τοῦ βίου, εὐχόμενος ὁρᾶσθαι ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ, ὡς φροντίδα ποιούμενος τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ἀνθρώπων. Δεῖ δέ φησι καὶ ὁ Πλάτων τούτοις πιστεύειν. Hence the custom, very early, of asking the living martyrs for their intercession after death. Thus *Euseb. de Martyr. Palæst. cap.* 7, relates that a certain Theodocia in Cæsarea approached the martyrs who were awaiting death, ὁμοῦ φιλοφρονουμένη, καὶ οἷα εἰκὸς ὑπὲρ τοῦ μνημονεύειν αὐτῆς πρὸς τὸν κύριον γενομένους παρακαλοῦσα. On the other hand, there is as yet no trace of prayers to the dead.

10 See above § 52, note 93. *Euseb. de Martyr. Palæst.* c. 3. *hist. eccl.* VII, c. 12.

11 Comp. § 52, note 40. *Cyprian. ep.* 83. *Petri Alex. Epist. canon. c.* 9;

Whilst we cannot overlook the moral danger of all these prejudices and errors, we must still feel and reverence the philanthropic spirit which Christianity had awakened in its professors; especially as it was not confined to their Christian brethren,[12] but extended its benefits even to the heathen.[13]

Mensurius Episc. Carth. about A. D. 300 *in Augustini brevic. collat. Dies* III *cap.* 13. *Can. Illiberitan.* c. 60: Si quis idola fregerit, et ibidem fuerit occisus, quatenus in evangelio scriptum non est, neque invenitur ab Apostolis unquam factum, placuit in numero eum non recipi martyrum.

12 Thus the church at Rome in the middle of the third century *(Cornelius Ep. Rom. ap. Euseb.* VI. 43, 5) had χήρας σὺν θλιβομένοις ὑπὲρ τὰς χιλίας πεντακοσίας, οὓς πάντας ἡ τοῦ δεσπότου χάρις καὶ φιλανθρωπία διατρέφει, and besides that sent help to the Churches in Syria, Arabia, (vid. *Dionys. Alex.* in *Euseb.* VII. 5, 1.), and Cappadocia *(Basil. M. Ep.* 70). Comp. above, § 52, note 8. — Cyprian, when in exile, writes, *Ep.* 36 *ad clerum:* Viduarum et infirmorum et omnium pauperum curam peto diligenter habeatis. Sed et peregrinis, si qui indigentes fuerint, sumptus suggeratis de quantitate mea propria, quam apud Rogatianum compresbyterum nostrum dimisi. Quæ quantitas ne forte jam universa erogata sit, nisi eidem — aliam portionem, ut largius et promptius circa laborantes fiat operatio. *Epist.* 60, he sends to the Numidian bishops to enable them to ransom their brother from the barbarians, sestertia centum millia nummorum, which he had collected in his church. Et optamus quidem nihil tale de cetero fieri: — Si tamen — tale aliquid acciderit, nolite cunctari nuntiare hæc nobis literis vestris, pro certo habentes ecclesiam, nostram et fraternitatem istic universam ne hæc ultra fiant precibus orare, si facta fuerint, libenter et largiter subsidia præstare. *Epist.* 61, *ad Euchratium*, bishop of Thenis, in reference to a converted *histrio*, who had been thus forced to give up his employment: Quod si illic ecclesia non sufficit ut laborantibus præstet alimenta, poterit se ad nos transferre, et hic quod sibi ad victum atque ad vestitum necessarium fuerit accipere.

13 Comp. *Vita S. Cypriani per Pontium Diac. c.* 9: Speaking of the conduct of Cyprian and his church on occasion of a ravaging plague: Aggregatam primo in loco uno plebem de misericordiæ bonis instituit, docens divinæ lectionis exemplis, quantum ad promerendum Deum prosint officia pietatis. Tunc deinde subjungit, non esse mirabile, si nostros tantum debito caritatis obsequio foveremus: eum perfectum posse fieri qui plus aliquid publicano vel ethnico fecerit: qui malum bono vincens, et divinæ clementiæ instar exercens, inimicos quoque dilexerit: qui pro persequentium se salute, sicuti Dominus monet et hortatur, orarit. Oriri Deus facit jugiter solem suum, et pluvias subinde nutriendis seminibus impertit, exhibens cuncta ista non suis tantum, sed etiam alienis: et qui se Dei etiam filium esse profitetur, cur non exemplum patris imitatur? Respondere, inquit, nos decet natalibus nostris, et quos renatos per Deum constat, degeneres esse non congruit; sed probare potius in sobole traducem boni patris æmulatione bonitatis. *Cap.* 10: Multa alia, et quidem magna prætereo. — Quod si illa gentiles pro rostris audire potuissent, forsitan statim crederent. Quid Christiana plebs faceret, cui de fide nomen est? Distributa sunt ergo continuo pro qualitate hominum atque ordinum ministeria. Multi qui angustia paupertatis beneficia sumtus exhibere non poterant, plus sumtibus exhibebant, compensantes proprio labore mercedem divitiis omnibus cariorem. — Fiebat itaque exuberantium operum largitate, quod bonum est ad omnes, non ad solos domesticos fidei, etc. *Dionysius Alex. ap. Euseb.* VII. c. 22 gives a similar account of the conduct of the Christians in Alexandria on a like occasion: οἱ γοῦν πλεῖστοι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν δι' ὑπερβάλλουσαν ἀγάπην καὶ φιλαδελφίαν ἀφειδοῦντες ἑαυτῶν καὶ ἀλλήλων ἐχόμενοι, ἐπισκοποῦντες ἀφυλάκτως τοὺς νοσοῦντας, λιπαρῶς ὑπηρετούμενοι, θεραπεύοντες ἐν Χριστῷ, συναπηλλάττοντο ἐκείνοις ἀσμενέστατα· τοῦ παρ' ἑτέρων ἀναπιμπλάμενοι πάθους, καὶ τὴν νόσον ἐφ' ἑαυτοὺς ἕλκοντες ἀπὸ τῶν πλησίον, καὶ ἑκόντες ἀναμασσόμενοι τὰς ἀλγηδόνας. — Τὰ δέ γε ἔθνη πᾶν τοὐναντίον· καὶ νοσεῖν ἀρχομένους ἀτωθοῦντο, καὶ ἀπέφευγον τοὺς φιλτάτους, κἂν ταῖς ὁδοῖς ἐρρίπτουν ἡμιθνῆτας· καὶ νεκροὺς ἀτάφους ἀπεσκυβαλίζοντο, τὴν τοῦ θανάτου διάδοσιν καὶ κοινωνίαν ἐκτρεπόμενοι.

SECOND PERIOD.

FROM CONSTANTINE TO THE CONTROVERSIES CONCERNING THE WORSHIP OF IMAGES.

A. D. 324 — 726.

For the general history of the middle ages: Ed. Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. Lond. 1776–88. 4to.* F. C. Schlosser, Weltgeschichte in Zusammenhängender Erzählung. 1815. 8vo. (vol. 2 seq.). F. Rehm, Handbuch der Geschichte der Mittelalters. As yet only 12 vols. Marburg. 1821 and 24. 8vo. H. Leo, Lehrbuch d. Gesch. des Mittlealters. 2 Theile. Halæ. 1830. 8vo. [Hallam's Middle Ages. Mill's History of the Crusades. 2 vols. 8vo. History of Chivalry. 2 vols. 8vo. — James's Chivalry and the Crusades. — Tr.]

FIRST DIVISION.

TO THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON. A. D. 324 — 451.

SOURCES.

1. Greek Ecclesiastical Historians: The continuation of Eusebius. *Socrates Scholasticus*, of Constantinople, hist. eccl. libb. VII. from A. D. 306 – 439. *Hermias Sozomenus*, of Constantinople, hist. eccl. libb. IX. A. D. 323 – 423. (Both edited by H. Valesius. Paris. 1668. Mogunt. 1677. Amst. 1700. fol.) *Theodoretus*, bishop of Cyrus, hist. eccl. libb. V. A. D. 322 – 429. (in Theodoreti opp. ed. Jac. Sirmondus. Paris. 1642. fol. Tom. 3. P. 2. — in edit. Schulzii, cura J. A. Noesselt. T. 3. p. 719. Halæ. 1771. 8vo).[1] The Arian *Philostorgius* hist. eccl. libb. XII. A. D. 318 – 425 (to be found only in the extracts of Photius cod. 40. ed. Jac. Gothofredus. 1643. 4to.).

Farther Continuations: *Theodorus Lector*, of Constantinople, compiled extracts from Socr. Sozom. and Theodoret in two books, and continued the history of the year 518 in two more. (Of the continuation we have only fragments in the works of *Nicephorus Callistus*, who, in the year 1330, compiled a church history in 23 books, from the writings of ancient writers up to the tenth century; of this history we have the first 18 books to the year 610, ed. Fronto Ducæus. Paris.

---

* German, with remarks, Leipzig. 1788 – 1807. 19 vols. 8vo.

1 *F. A. Holzhausen* comm. de fontibus, quibus Socrates, Sozomenus ac Theodoretus in scribenda historia sacra usi sunt, ad juncta eorum epicrisi. Gotting. 1825. 4to.

1630. 2 vols. fol.) *Evagrius Scholasticus*, of Antioch, hist. eccl. libb. VI. from A. D. 431–594. Best editions: Theodoreti et Evagrii Schol. hist. eccl. item excerpta ex historiis Philostorgii et Theodori Lectoris, ed. H. Valesius. Paris. 1673. Mogunt. 1679. Amst. 1695. fol. — *Eusebii Pamphili, Socratis Schol., Herm. Sozomeni, Theodoreti*, et *Evagrii*, item *Philostorgii* et *Theodori Lectoris*, quæ exstant græce et latine. H. Valesius emendavit, latine vertit, et annotationibus illustravit, etc. Guil. Reading. Cantabrig. 1720. 3 T. fol. (A faulty edition August. Taurin. 1747.) *Chronicon Paschale*, (falsely called Alexandrinum), first part to year 354, second part to 628; each part written nearly at the time to which it reaches. ed. Car. du Fresne D. du Cange. Paris. 1688. fol.

II. Latin Ecclesiastical Historians: *Severus Sulpicius*, Presbyter in the diocese of Agen, histor. sacra libb. II. a mundo cond. — A. D. 400 (opp. ed. Jo. Clericus. Lips. 1709. 8vo. Hieron. de Prato, Veron. 1741–44. 2 voll. 4to.) *Rufinus*, Presb. in Aquileia, translated Eusebius in nine books, and continued the history in two books to the year 395 (Socrates. hist. eccl. II. 1. speaks of the merits of this supplement), ed. P. T. Cacciari. Rome. 1740–41. 4to. — *Historia tripartita* lib. XII. compiled from Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret by Cassiodorus and Epiphanius Scholasticus, about the year 500. This work and that of Rufinus were the chief historical sources in the middle ages; published together by Beatus Rhenanus. Basil. 1523 — besides many other editions in the same century.

III. Acts of the Councils in the Collect. Concill. G. D. Fuch's Library of the ecclesiastical councils of the fourth and fifth centuries. Leip. 1780–84. 4 vols. 4to. *Synodicon vetus*, a concise account of the various councils up to the year 869. prim. ed. *Jo. Pappus*. Argent. 1601. 4to. also in *G. Voelli* et *H. Justelli* bibl. juris Canon. veteris. T. II. p. 1166: and in *Fabricii* bibl. græca, vol. XI. p. 185. ed. nov. vol. XII. p. 360 seq. — see esp. cap. 34–90.

IV. Imperial Decrees: *Codex Theodosianus* (compiled in the year 438 — partly lost) cum comm. Jacobi Gothofredi, cur. Jo. D. Ritter. Lips. 1737. 6 vols. fol. Jus civile Antejustinianeum a Soc. Juris Consultorum curatum, præfatus est G. Hugo. Berol. 1815. T. 2. 8.

V. Heathen Historians: *Ammianus Marcellinus*, rerum gest. libb. xxxi. Only libb. 14–31 are extant — (from year 353–378.) ed. J. Gronov. 1693. fol. J. A. Ernesti. Lips. 1773. 8vo. — *Zosimus*, ἱστορία νέα, libb. VI. (to the year 410) ed. Chr. Cellarius. Cizæ. 1679. J. F. Reitemeier. Lips. 1784. 8vo.).[2]

---

2 As to the worth of Zosimus' history, the opinions are various. It is very favorably judged by *Jo. Leunclavius* (Apologia pro Zosimo, in his Romanæ hist. scripp. minores, Francof. 1590. fol. reprinted in the ed. of Cellarius) and *Reitemeier* (disquis. de Zosimo prefixed to his ed.): quite the contrary by the older church-historians, and by *Guil. de Sainte-Croix*, observations sur Zosime, in the Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscriptions, T. 49 (1808), p. 466 seq.

CHAPTER FIRST.

FINAL STRUGGLE BETWEEN CHRISTIANITY AND PAGANISM.

J. G. Hoffman, ruina superstitionis paganæ variis observatt. ex historia eccl. sæc. IV. et V. illustrata. Vitemb. 1738. 4to. *S. T. Rüdiger* de statu et conditione paganorum sub Impp. Christianis post Constantinum. Vratislav. 1825. 8vo.

§ 73.

THE CHRISTIANS FAVORED BY CONSTANTINE AND HIS SONS.

Martini über die Einführung der christl. Religion als Staatsreligion im röm. Reiche durch d. Kaiser Constantin. Munich. 1813. 4to. § 29 ff.

Though Constantine was not baptized till just before his death, in the year 337, when the rite was administered by Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia,[1] he had openly declared himself for Christianity ever since his victory over Licinius;[2] recommending it to his subjects by personal persuasion,[3] seeking to make it attractive by constant marks of favor to the Christians,[4] and engaging with great zeal in the erection

---

1 Eusebius de vita Constant. IV. c. 61. 62.

2 Some of the later heathen writers (*Juliani* Cæsares, at the close of the work. *Zosimus* II. 29. *Sozomenus* I. 5) maintained, that the emperor was driven to embrace Christianity by remorse for the murder of his son Crispus and his empress Fausta (A. D. 326); but it may easily be proved that his conversion was at an earlier date. Comp. Manso's Leben Constantins d. G. Breslau. 1817. 8vo. S. 119.

3 See his rescripts to the Oriental provinces in Euseb. de vita Constant. II. 24–42, 48–60. Concerning his orations in favor of Christianity, cf. IV. 29, 32, 55. One of them has been preserved by Eusebius in the Append. to his work de vita Const.

4 *Euseb. de vita Const.* IV. 28: *Ταῖς δ' ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ θεοῦ καθ' ὑπεροχὴν ἐξαίρετον πλεῖσθ' ὅσα παρεῖχεν· ὧδε μὲν ἀγρούς, ἀλλαχόθι δὲ σιτοδοσίας, ἐπὶ χορηγίᾳ πενήτων ἀνδρῶν, παίδων τ' ὀρφανῶν, κ. τ. λ.* Comp. the emperor's directions to the bishops about the disposition of the new means put into their hands for the conversion of the Heathen, l. c. III. c. 21. He goes on the principle, that on most men external advantages make more impression than reasoning and truth: *διὸ πρὸς πάντας ἁρμόττισθαι δεῖ, ἰατροῦ δίκην ἑκάστῳ τά λυσιτελῆ πρὸς σωτηρίαν ποριζομένους· ὥστ' ἐξ ἁπάντος τὴν σωτήριον παρὰ τοῖς πᾶσι δοξάζεσθαι διδασκαλίαν.* In this way he himself converted the heathen inhabitants of Heliopolis in Phœnicia, l. c. III. 58: *προνοῶν,—ὅπως ἂν πλείους προσίοιεν τῷ λόγῳ, τὰ πρὸς ἐπικουρίαν τῶν πενήτων ἔκπλεια παρεῖχε, καὶ ταύτῃ προτρέπων ἐπὶ τὴν σωτήριον σπεύδειν διδασκαλίαν· μονονουχὶ τῷ φάντι παραπλησίως εἰπὼν ἂν καὶ αὐτός· "εἴτε προφάσει, εἴτ' ἀληθείᾳ Χριστὸς καταγγελλέσθω* (Phil. i. 18.)." Rewards bestowed on the places which declared in favor of Christianity, l. c. IV. 38, 39.

of churches,[5] some of which were very splendid, and providing for them out of the common fund of the cities in which they were placed.[6]

Still, however, the considerable families of the empire remained, for the most part, heathen; and thus, notwithstanding his wish to make his new Rome, (Constantinople,) as much as possible a Christian city,[7] and to advance none but Christians to the highest posts,[8] the emperor was forced to have Heathen about his person, and in the more important offices of state.[9]

The only violent measures of Constantine against Paganism were the confiscation of various temples which were but little frequented, (the proceeds of which he converted to the use of Christian churches, or the building of Constantinople,)[10] and the prohibition of certain scandalous heathen rites.[11] The law, which he is said to have passed

---

5 See his rescript on all bishops, *Euseb. de vit. Const.* II. 46, in which he directs them σπουδάζειν περὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν· καὶ ἡ ἐπανορθοῦσθαι τὰ ὄντα, ἢ εἰς μείζονα αὔξειν, ἢ ἔνθα ἂν χρεία ἀπαιτῇ, καινὰ ποιεῖν. Αἰτήσεις δὲ — τὰ ἀναγκαῖα παρά τε τῶν ἡγεμόνων, καὶ τῆς ἐπαρχικῆς τάξεως. τούτοις γὰρ ἐπεστάλθη, πάσῃ προθυμίᾳ ἐξυπηρετήσασθαι τοῖς ὑπὸ τῆς σῆς ὁσιότητος λεγομένοις. On the orders issued to the Præsides Prov. see II. 45. — The following were built by the express order of Constantine: One at the *holy sepulchre* (τὸ Μαρτύριον· ἡ ἐκκλησία τῆς τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἀναστάσεως, A. D. 326 — 335. *Euseb.* l. c. 25 — 40. IV. 43 — 45. Comp. *E. F. Wernsdorf's* two programs: Hist. templi Constantiniani propter resurrectionis Christi locum exstructi, and De templi Constantiniani, etc. sollemni dedicatione. Viteberg. 1770. 4to.) on the Mount of *Olives* and in *Bethlehem* (last built by Helena, l. c. III. 41 — 43), in *Nicomedia* and *Antioch* (III. 50), in *Mambre* (III. 51), in *Heliopolis* (III. 58), many churches in *Constantinople* (III. 48), especially the churches of the *Apostles* (IV. 58 — 60). cf. *Jo. Ciampinus* de sacris ædificiis a Const. M. exstructis. Romæ. 1693. fol.

6 *Sozomenus*, V. c. 5: Ἡνίκα Κωνσταντῖνος τὰ τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν διέταττε πράγματα, ἐκ τῶν ἑκάστης πόλεως φόρων τὰ ἀρκοῦντα (according to Theodoret IV. 4, a σύνταξις σίτου) πρὸς παρασκευὴν ἐπιστηδείων ἀπίεμε τοῖς πανταχοῦ κλήροις, καὶ νόμῳ τοῦτο ἐκράτυνεν. The unhappy effect of these measures and the exemption of the clergy on the state of municipal affairs is shown by *F. Roth* de re municipali Romanorum libb. II. Stuttg. 1801. p. 32 seq. Hegewisch hist. Versuch über d. röm. Finanzen. Altona. 1804. S. 324 ff.

7 *Euseb. de vita Const.* III. 48. τὴν πόλιν — καθαρεύειν εἰδωλολατρείας ἀπάσης ἐδικαίου· ὡς μηδαμοῦ φαίνεσθαι ἐν αὐτῇ τῶν νομιζομένων θεῶν ἀγάλματα ἐν ἱεροῖς θρησκευόμενα, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ βωμοὺς λύθροις αἱμάτων μιαινομένους, οὐ θυσίας ὁλοκαυτουμένας πυρὶ, οὐ δαιμονικὰς ἑορτὰς, οὐδ' ἕτερόν τι τῶν συνήθων τοῖς δεισιδαίμοσιν. Constantine did, nevertheless, decorate his new city with works of art, and even with statues of the Gods. The ναοὶ δύο with the images of Rhea, and the Fortuna Romæ, mentioned by Zosimus, were probably only niches. The tradition (found in Zonaras, Cedrenus, etc.), that Constantine dedicated his city to the mother of God, is improbable to absurdity.

8 *Euseb. l. c.* II. 44: τοῖς κατ' ἐπαρχίας διῃρημένοις ἔθνεσιν ἡγεμόνας κατέπεμπε, τῇ σωτηρίῳ πίστει καθωσιωμένους τοὺς πλείους· ὅσοι δ' ἑλληνίζειν ἐδόκουν, τούτοις θύειν ἀπείρητο. (cf. IV. 52.)

9 cf. *Rüdiger* de statu et conditione Paganorum post Constant. p. 12 seq.

10 *Euseb.* l. c. III. 54. *Libanius* in various passages (see below note 12) Martini, S. 38. *Rüdiger*, p. 21 seq.

11 Thus the worship of Venus in Phœnicia, *Euseb.* l. c. III. 55, 58. IV. 37, 38. The scandalous worship of the Nile, *Euseb.* IV. 25. Martini, S. 36 f. 39 f *Rüdiger*, p. 23 seq.

shortly before his death, by which all sacrifice was forbidden,[12] was certainly never carried into operation.

After the death of *Constantine* II. (A. D. 340), *Constantius* governed in the East, and *Constans* in the West. Both were alike hostile to Paganism,[13] but Constans was obliged to show it some indulgence, on account of the strong attachment still manifested in the West, and especially at Rome, for the monuments of the ancient religion.[14] Nor were any violent measures taken against Paganism till after the death of Constans in the year 350, when the whole empire having devolved on Constantius, all sacrifices were prohibited on pain of death.[15] At Rome and Alexandria, however, the prohibi-

---

12 *Constantius* (see the following note) refers to such a law, and *Eusebius*, l. c. II. 45, speaks expressly of a *νόμος εἴργων τὰ μυσαρὰ τῆς — εἰδωλολατρείας, ὡς μήτε ἐγίρσεις ξοάνων ποιεῖσθαι τολμᾷν, μήτε μαντείαις καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις περιεργίαις ἐπιχειρεῖν, μήτε μὴν θύειν καθόλου μηδένα.* So too IV. 23, 25; also the later writers, some of whom, e. g. Theophanes, speak even of capital punishments decreed by Constantine against the Heathen, see Martini, S. 34, Obs. 67. On the other hand it is remarkable that this law is nowhere to be found, whilst Constantine himself, *Epist. ad Provinciales Orientis* (*Euseb.* l. c. II. 60), says: *τινὲς, ὡς ἀκούω, φασὶ τῶν ναῶν περιιρῆσθαι τὰ ἔθη καὶ τοῦ σκότους τὴν ἐξουσίαν· ὅπερ συνεβούλευσα ἂν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, εἰ μὴ τῆς μοχθηρᾶς πλάνης ἡ βίαιος ἐπανάστασις — ἀμίστρως ταῖς ἐνίων ψυχαῖς ἐμπεπήγει.* And *Libanius* asserts of him, *Orat. pro templis* § 3. (*ed. Reiske, vol.* II. *p.* 161): *εἰς μὲν τὴν τῆς πόλεως, περὶ ἣν ἐσπούδασε, ποίησιν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἐχρήσατο χρήμασι, τῆς κατὰ νόμους δὲ θεραπείας ἐκίνησεν οὐδὲ ἕν.* According to *Gothofredus* (*ad Cod. Theod. Lib.* XVI. *Tit.* 10. *L.* 3.), such a law was actually passed, but in the last years of Constantine's life: Martini, S. 40, supposes that Constantius and Eusebius refer to the laws passed against immoral rites: *Rüdiger*, p. 18 seq., thinks that a general prohibition was issued by Constantine, but taken back again.

13 *Cod. Theodos.* lib. XVI. Tit. 10. L. 2. (A. D. 341): Cesset superstitio, sacrificiorum aboleatur insania. Nam quicunque contra legem divi principis parentis nostri, et hanc nostræ mansuetudinis jussionem ausus fuerit sacrificia celebrare, competens in eum vindicta et præsens sententia exseratur. What fanatical views were even then preached to the emperors, may be seen from *Julius Firmicus Maternus* in the *lib. de errore profanorum religionum*, A. D. 340–350: Vobis, sacratissimi Imperatores, ad vindicandum et puniendum hoc malum necessitas imperatur, et hoc vobis Dei summi lege præcipitur, ut severitas vestra idololatriæ facinus omnifariam persequatur. Audite et commendate sanctis sensibus vestris, quid de isto facinore Deus jubeat. (Then he cites *Deut.* xiii. 6–10. Then): Nec filio jubet parci, nec fratri, et per amatam conjugem gladium vindicem ducit. Amicum quoque sublimi severitate persequitur, et ad discerpenda sacrilegorum corpora omnis populus armatur. Integris etiam civitatibus, si in isto fuerint facinore deprehensæ, decernuntur excidia: et ut hoc Providentia Vestra manifestius discat, constitutæ legis sententiam proferam, etc.

14 *Cod. Theod. XVI.* 10, 3, *ad Catullinum Præf. Urbi* (A. D. 342): Quanquam omnis superstitio penitus eruenda sit, tamen volumus, ut ædes templorum, quæ extra muros sunt positæ, intactæ incorruptæque consistant. Nam cum ex nonnullis vel ludorum, vel circensium, vel agonum origo fuerit exorta, non convenit ea convelli, ex quibus populo Romano præbeatur priscarum solennitas voluptatum. About A. D. 347 a traveller (*Vetus Orbis descriptio ed. J. Gothofredi.* 1628. *p.* 35) found in Rome 7 Vestals, also the worship of Jupiter, of Sol, and of the Mater Deum. Comp. Gothofredi not. p. 40 seq.

15 *Cod. Theod. XVI.* 10, 4. (A. D. 353): Placuit, omnibus locis atque urbibus universis claudi protinus templa, et accessu vetitis omnibus, licentiam delin-

tion seems not to have been strictly regarded,[16] though everywhere else the Heathen were obliged to conceal themselves in remote places in the country:[17] hence the names Pagani, Paganismus.[18] Constantius died in the year 361.

These violent measures had the effect, it is true, of opening the eyes of the people to the impotence of their Gods, and the impostures of their priests:[19] but, with more elevated minds, they only increased the prejudice against a religion so intolerant, and propagated by such means. What of truth they discovered in its precepts, was traced back to their own philosophers.[20] The positive doctrines of Christianity they regarded as foreign superstitions, whilst the controversies concerning them in the church itself, brought Christianity into suspicion, and Christians into ridicule.* At the same time it served greatly to recommend Paganism, that the ancient classic literature, containing a religion at once pure and peculiarly rational, seemed in a manner to belong to it, and to be wrapt up in it.† The most famous schools in

---

quendi perditis abnegari. Volumus etiam, cunctos sacrificiis abstinere. Quodsi quis aliquid forte hujusmodi perpetraverit, gladio ultore sternatur. Facultates etiam peremti fisco decernimus vindicari, et similiter affligi rectores provinciarum, si facinora vindicare neglexerint. Comp. L. 5. (A. D. 353) and L. 6. (A. D. 356) — *Cod. Theodos.* lib. XVI. Tit. 8. L. 7. (A. D. 357): Si quis, lege venerabili constituta, ex Christiano Judæus effectus sacrilegis cœtibus aggregetur, cum accusatio fuerit comprobata, facultates ejus dominio fisci jussimus vindicari.

16 The prefects of the city at this time were heathen. See *Rüdiger*, p. 31. seq. — *Symmachus Lib.* X. *Ep.* 61 (also Opp. S. Ambrosii ed. Benedict. T. III. p. 872. Comp. the remarks of Benedict) says in reference to the presence of Constantius in Rome A. D. 357: Nihil decerpsit sacrarum virginum privilegiis, decrevit nobilibus sacerdotia, Romanis cæremoniis non negavit impensas, et per omnes vias æternæ urbis lætum secutus senatum, vidit placido ore delubra, legit inscripta fastigiis deum nomina, percontatus est templorum origines, miratus est conditores. Cumque alias religiones ipse sequeretur, has servavit imperio.

17 Especially on account of the spies sent out by the emperors, Curiosi; see *Valesius ad Ammian. Marc.* XV. 3, 8.

18 Paulus Orosius (about A. D. 416) hist. præf. qui ex locorum agrestium compitis et pagis pagani vocantur. This expression occurs first in a law of Valentinian, A. D. 368, (Cod. Theodos. lib. XVI. Tit. 2. 1. 18.), and in *Marinus Victorinus* de ὁμοουσίῳ recipiendo (Græci, quos ἕλληνας vel Paganos vocant, multos Deos dicunt). Under Theodosius this name had already become the common one. cf. *Gothofredus* and *C. H. Fabroti* ad Cod. Theod. lib. XVI. Tit. 10. notæ in titulum (ed. Ritter, p. 274 seq.).

19 *Eusebius de vita Const.* III. 57: πάντες δ' οἱ πρὶν δεισιδαίμονες, τὸν ἔλεγχον τῆς αὐτῶν πλάνης αὐταῖς ὄψισιν ὁρῶντες, τῶν δ' ἀπανταχοῦ νεῶν τε καὶ ἱδρυμάτων ἔργῳ θεώμενοι τὴν ἐρημίαν, οἱ μὲν τῷ σωτηρίῳ προσέφευγον λόγῳ, οἱ δ', εἰ καὶ τοῦτο μὴ ἔπραττον, τῆς γοῦν πατρῴας κατεγίνωσκον ματαιότητος, ἐγέλων τε καὶ κατεγίλων τῶν πάλαι νομιζομένων αὐτοῖς θεῶν.

20 *Augustinus Ep.* 34. mentions libros beatissimi Papæ Ambrosii, — quos adversus nonnullos imperitissimos et superbissimos, qui de Platonis libris Dominum profecisse contendunt, diligentissime et copiosissime scripsit.

* Euseb. de vita Constant. II. c. 61.

† Libanius in his Apologeticus, ed. Reiske vol. III. p. 437, dates the decline of letters from the persecution of the Heathen by Constantine.

Alexandria, Athens,[21] and other places, had all heathen teachers: the New-Platonic philosophy was still steadily contending for Paganism.[22] *Jamblicus* (+A. D. 333), the great orators, *Libanius* (+A. D. 395), *Himerius* (+A. D. 390), and *Themistius* (+ A. D. 390), were Heathen: whilst there were but few Christian scholars, who, like the two Apollonaris at Laodicea, could vie with these men; and these few had to struggle with the prevailing prejudices against *heathen learning*. Thus it happened, that all the most distinguished orators among the Christians were formed in the heathen schools.

Under such circumstances, we cannot think it strange, that the highest ranks of society should have been the most strongly attached to Paganism,* or be surprised to hear, even from Christian writers, that of the numbers who were now converted to Christianity, the greater part were swayed merely by external motives.[23] Others, again, wavered between the old and the new religion, hoping to find the truth in a middle course. These even went so far as to form themselves into sects, of which we have in history the *Massalians* (Euchites, Euphemites, θεοσεβεῖς) in Phœnicia and Palestine,[24] and in Cappa-

---

21 See Schlosser in his Archive für Gesch. v. Literatur, Bd. 1. p. 217. Concerning the last of these, Athens, vid. Ullmanns Gregorius von Nazianz (Darmstadt. 1825) S. 27 ff. *Gregorii Nazianz. Orat.* XX. p. 331 (*ed. Bened.* Orat. XLIII. p. 787): βλαβεραὶ μὲν — Ἀθῆναι, τὰ εἰς ψυχήν· καὶ γὰρ πλουτοῦσι τὸν κακὸν πλοῦτον, τὰ εἴδωλα, μᾶλλον τῆς ἄλλης Ἑλλάδος, καὶ χαλεπὸν μὴ συναρπασθῆναι τοῖς τούτων ἐπαινέταις καὶ συνηγόροις.

22 *Eunapius in vita Ædesii* (in the beginning): Κωνσταντῖνος ἐβασίλευε, τά τε τῶν ἱερῶν ἐπιφανίσταται καταστρέφων, καὶ τὰ τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀνεγείρων οἰκήματα· τὰ δὲ ἴσως καὶ τὸ τῶν ὁμιλητῶν ἄριστον πρὸς μυσταγωγῶν πινὰ σιωπὴν καὶ ἱεροφαντικὴν ἐχεμυθίαν ἐπιῤῥέπες ἦν καὶ συνεκέκλιτο.

* Comp. Libanii orat. pro Arist. ed. Reiske, vol. 1. p. 447 seq.

23 *Eusebius vita Const.* IV. 54: καὶ γὰρ οὖν ἀληθῶς δύο χαλεπὰ ταῦτα κατὰ τοὺς δηλουμένους τούτους χρόνους καὶ αὐτοὶ κατενοήσαμεν· ἐπιτριβὴν ἀπλήστων καὶ μοχθηρῶν ἀνδρῶν τῶν πάντα λυμαινομένων βίον· εἰρωνείαν τ' ἄλεκτον τῶν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ὑποδυομένων καὶ τὸ Χριστιανῶν ἐπιπλάστως σχηματιζομένων ὄνομα. Τὸ δ' αὐτοῦ (Κωνσταντίνου) φιλάνθρωπον καὶ φιλάγαθον — ἐνῆγεν αὐτὸν πιστεύειν τῷ σχήματι τῶν Χριστιανῶν εἶναι νομιζομένων. *Libanius orat. pro templis* (*ed. Reiske. vol.* II. p. 177) καταστάντες δὲ εἰς σχῆμα τὸ τῶν εὐχομένων, ἢ οὐδένα καλοῦσιν, ἢ τοὺς θεούς, οὐ καλῶς μὲν ἐκ τοῦ τοιούτου χωρίου, καλοῦσι δ' οὖν. Ὥσπερ οὖν ἐν ταῖς τραγῳδίαις ὁ τὸν τύραννον εἰσιὼν οὐκ ἐστί τύραννος, ἀλλ' ὅπερ ἦν πρὸ τοῦ προσωπείου· οὕτω καὶ ἐκείνων ἕκαστος τηρεῖ μὲν αὐτὸν ἀκίνητον, δοκεῖ δὲ τούτοις κεκινῆσθαι. *Augustinus in Evang. Joannis Tract.* 25. § 10: Quam multi non quærunt Jesum, nisi ut illis faciat bene secundum tempus! Alius negotium habet, quærit intercessionem clericorum: alius premitur a potentiore, fugit ad ecclesiam: alius pro se vult interveniri apud eum, apud quem parum valet: ille sic, ille sic: impletur quotidie talibus ecclesia. Vix quæritur Jesus propter Jesum.

24 *Epiphanius hær.* LXXX. *Massalianorum*, § 1. Μασσαλιανοὶ, Εὐφημῖται — ἐξ Ἑλλήνων ὡρμῶντο, οὔτε Ἰουδαϊσμῷ προσανίχοντες, οὔτε Χριστιανοὶ ὑπάρχοντες, οὔτε ἀπὸ Σαμαρειτῶν, ἀλλὰ μόνον Ἕλληνες ὄντες δῆθεν· καὶ θεοὺς μὲν λέγοντες, μηδενὶ μηδὲν προσκυνοῦντες, ἐνὶ δὲ μόνῳ δῆθεν τὸ σέβας νέμοντες καὶ καλοῦντες παντοκράτορα· τινὰς δὲ οἴκους ἑαυτοῖς κατασκευάσαντες, ἢ τόπους πλατεῖς, φόρων δίκην, προσευχὰς ταύτας ἱκάλουν. — § 2: — ἐν ἄλλοις δὲ τόποις φύσει καὶ Ἐκκλησίας ὁμοιώματι ἑαυτοῖς ποιή-

docia the *Hypsistarii*, of nearly the same tenets,[25] in the beginning of the fourth century; and towards the end of it, the *Cœlicolæ* in Africa.[26] None of these sects was of much importance, or of long duration.

σαντες, καθ' ἱσπέραν καὶ κατὰ τὴν ὕω, μετὰ πολλῆς λυχναψίας καὶ φώτων συναθροιζόμενοι, ἐπὶ πολύ τε καταλεγμάτιά τινα ὑπὸ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς σπουδαίων, καὶ εὐφημίας τινὰς δῆθεν εἰς τὸν θεὸν ποιούμενοι (ὡς καταλεγματίων καὶ εὐφημιῶν), ὥσπερ θεὸν ἐξιλεούμενοι ἑαυτοὺς ἀκατῶσιν. *Cyrillus Alex. de adoratione in spiritu et veritate Lib.* III. (*ed. Auberti* T. I. p. 92), in speaking of the religion of those in ancient times, who were not the children of Abraham, Jethro, Melchisedek, etc. προσκύνουν μὲν γὰρ — ὑψίστῳ θεῷ, — προσεδέχοντο δὲ καὶ ἑτέρους τάχα που θεοὺς, ἐναριθμοῦντες αὐτῷ τὰ ἐξαίρετα τῶν κτισμάτων, γῆν τε καὶ οὐρανὸν, ἥλιον, καὶ σελήνην, καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄστρων ἐπισημότερα. Καὶ πλημμέλημα μὲν ἀρχαῖον ἡ ἐπὶ τῷδε καταφθορὰ καὶ πλάνησις, δήκει δὲ καὶ εἰς δεῦρο καὶ παρατείνεται· φρονοῦσι γὰρ ὧδε παραπληροῦντες ἔτι τῶν ἐν τῇ Φοινίκῃ καὶ Παλαιστίνῃ τινὲς, οἱ σφᾶς μὲν αὐτοὺς θεοσεβεῖς ὀνομάζουσιν, οἶμαι δέ τινα θρησκείας διαστείχουσι μέσην, οὔτε τοῖς Ἰουδαίων ἔθεσι καθαρῶς, οὔτε τοῖς Ἑλλήνων προσκείμενοι, εἰς ἄμφω δὲ ὥσπερ διαῤῥιπτούμενοι καὶ μεμερισμένοι. To these, too, Libanius probably refers, *Epist. ad Priscianum, Præsidem Palæstinæ* (*ed. Vales. in not. ad Socr.* I. 22. *Libanii Epist. ed. Wolf, p.* 624): οἱ τὸν ἥλιον οὗτοι θεραπεύοντες ἄνευ αἵματος καὶ τιμῶντες θεὸν προσηγορίᾳ δευτέρᾳ, καὶ τὴν γαστέρα κολάζοντες, καὶ ἐν κέρδει ποιούμενοι τὴν τῆς τελευτῆς ἡμέραν, πολλαχοῦ μὲν εἰσὶ τῆς γῆς, πανταχοῦ δὲ ὀλίγοι, καὶ ἀδικοῦσι μὲν οὐδένα, λυποῦνται δὲ ὑπ' ἐνίων. Βούλομαι δὲ τοὺς ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ τούτων διατρίβοντας τὴν σὴν ἀρετὴν ἔχειν καταφυγὴν, καὶ εἶναι σφίσιν ἄδειαν, καὶ μὴ ἐξεῖναι τοῖς βουλομένοις εἰς αὐτοὺς ὑβρίζειν. Valesius supposes Manichæans to have been meant here.

25 Concerning this sect see especially Gregory of Nazianzum, in his funeral oration upon his father, who had formerly been one of their number. *Orat.* XVIII. (*al.* XIX.) § 5. He describes the party as ἐκ δυοῖν τοῖν ἐναντιωτάτοιν συγκεκραμένη, ἑλληνικῆς τε πλάνης καὶ νομικῆς τερατείας, ὧν ἀμφοτέρων τὰ μέρη φυγών, ἐκ μέρων συνετίθη. τῆς μὲν γὰρ τὰ εἴδωλα καὶ τὰς θυσίας ἀποστεμπόμενοι, τιμῶσι τὸ πῦρ καὶ τὰ λύχνα· τῆς δὲ τὸ σάββατον αἰδούμενοι, καὶ τὴν περὶ τὰ βρώματα (*leg.* τὸ περὶ τὰ βρώματα) ἔς τινα μικρολογίαν, τὴν περιτομὴν ἀτιμάζουσι. Ὑψιστάριοι τοῖς ταπεινοῖς ὄνομα, καὶ ὁ παντοκράτωρ δὴ μόνος αὐτοῖς σεβάσμιος. Latest writings on the *Hypsistarii, Messalians,* θεοσεβεῖς, etc. *C. Ullmann* de Hypsistariis comm. Heidelb. 1823. 4to. *Guil. Boehmer* de Hypsistariis, opinionibusque quæ super eis præpositæ sunt. Berol. 1824. 8vo. Ullmann in den Heidelb. Jahrb. 1824. No. 47. A writer in the Jen. A. L. Z. Dec. 1824. S. 455. Ullmann Gregorius v. Nazianz. Darmst. 1825. S. 558. Boehmer Einige Bemerkungen zu den v. d. H. Prof. Ullmann und Gieseler aufgestellten Ansichten über den Ursprung und den Charakter der Hypsistarier. Hamb. 1826. 8vo. This last traces the origin of the Hypsistarii to a mixture of Judaism and Parsism. Boehmer, following Cyril (see note 24), supposes them to have been the same with the Messalians, or θεοσεβεῖς, acknowledging that their doctrine sprung from the true revelation, but was afterwards corrupted by Sabaism.

26 There are two laws of Honorius against this sect, as one not before known. *Cod. Theod. Lib.* XVI. *Tit.* 5. *L.* 43. A. D. 408, and *Lib.* XVI. *Tit.* 8. *L.* 19. A. D. 409. Comp. *Gothofredus* on this last law, and *J. A. Schmidt* hist. cœlicolarum. Helmst. 1704.

§ 74.

JULIAN THE APOSTATE.

A. Neander über den Kaiser Julianus u. sein Zeitalter. Leip. 1812. 8vo. (Comp. Schlosser's review in the Jena Allg. Lit. Zeitung. Jan. 1813. § 121 ff.) C. Ullman. Gregorius von Nazianz, der Theologe. Darmst. 1825. 8vo. S. 72 ff.

Julian was early prejudiced against Christianity by the wrongs he had endured from the first Christian emperors, and the attempts to force it upon him in his education, as well as by a secret intercourse with Maximus and the other New-Platonic philosophers, who had breathed a new spirit into the lifeless forms of Paganism.[1] On his accession to the imperial dignity (A. D. 361), he declared himself openly for the ancient national religion, to which he attempted to give a moral character by the introduction of various practices borrowed from Christianity:[2] believing all the time that he was but restoring the worship of the Gods to its original purity. He took away the privileges of the Christians,[3] and forbade their teaching publicly in the schools:[4] though in all other respects he promised to leave them unmolested. Afterwards, however, he was guilty of some instances of injustice towards them, though often, no doubt, provoked by their unreasonable zeal.[5] They suffered most, however, from the Heathen

---

1 *Henke* de theologia Juliani diss. 1777 (rec. in ejusd. opusc. academ. Lips. 1802. p. 353 seq.) — Neander, l. c.

2 *Juliani epist.* 49. ad Arsacium Pontif. Galatiæ, on the morals and conduct of priests (comp. Ullmann's Gregor v. Nazianz, S. 527 ff.), support of the poor, and erection of houses for the reception of strangers. — Ep. 52, concerning penitents. — Still more on the subject, Sozomenus, V. 16. *Gregorii Nazianz.* adv. Julian. orat. III. (ed. Col. 1690. p. 101 seq.)

3 The law concerning the restoration of the estates held by them in the city, has, strangely enough, found its way into the *Cod. Theod. Lib.* X. *Tit.* L. 1. cf. *Sozom.* V. 5.

4 *Juliani epist.* 42. — "Ἄτοπον εἶναί μοι φαίνεται διδάσκειν ἐκεῖνα τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ὅσα μὴ νομίζουσιν εὖ ἔχειν· ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν οἷόνται σοφὰ, ὧν εἰσιν ἐξήγηται, καὶ ὧν ὥσπερ τροφῆται κάθηνται, ζηλούτωσαν αὐτῶν πρῶτον τὴν εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσέβειαν. εἰ δὲ [del. εἰς] τοὺς τιμιωτάτους ὑπολαμβάνουσι πεπλανῆσθαι, βαδιζόντων εἰς τὰς τῶν Γαλιλαίων ἐκκλησίας, ἐξηγησόμενοι Ματθαῖον καὶ Λουκᾶν, κ. τ. λ. *Socrates* III. 12. 16. *Sozomenus* V. 18. *Ammian. Marcellin.* XXII. 10: Illud autem erat inclemens, obruendum perenni silentio, quod arcebat docere magistros Rhetoricos et Grammaticos, ritus Christiani cultores (cf. XXV. 4).

5 *Juliani Ep.* 52, *ad Bostrenos* concerning the Christian bishops: — "ὅτι μὴ συρεινεῖν ἔξεστι αὐτοῖς, — παροξυνόμενοι πάντα κινοῦσι λίθον, καὶ συνταράττειν τολμῶσι τὰ πλήθη, καὶ στασιάζειν. — Οὐδένα γοῦν αὐτῶν ἄκοντα πρὸς βωμοὺς ἐῶμεν ἕλκεσθαι· διαῤῥήδην δὲ αὐτοῖς προσαγορεύομεν, εἴ τις ἑκὼν χερνίβων καὶ σπονδῶν ἡμῖν ἐθέλει κοινωνεῖν, καθάρσια προσφέρεσθαι πρῶτον, καὶ τοὺς ἀποτροπαίους ἱκετεύειν θεούς. — Τὰ γοῦν πλήθη τὰ παρὰ τῶν λεγομένων Κληρικῶν ἐξηπατημένα πρόδηλον ὅτι ταύτης ἀφαιρεθείσης στασιάζει τῆς ἀδείας. Οἱ γὰρ εἰς τοῦτο στεγνωνηκότες — πεθοῦντες δὲ τὴν προστέραν δυναστείαν ὅτι μὴ δικάζειν ἔξεστιν αὐτοῖς, καὶ γράφειν διαθήκας, καὶ ἀλλοτρίους σφετερίζεσθαι κλήρους, καὶ τὰ πάντα ἑαυτοῖς προσνέμειν, πάντα κινοῦσιν ἀκοσμίας κάλων — εἰς διάστασιν ἄγοντες τὰ πλήθη.

governors and populace. Julian respected the Jewish religion as an ancient national faith, and, when on his way to Persia, even allowed the Temple at Jerusalem to be rebuilt, though it was soon after destroyed again.[6] On this same expedition against the Persians he wrote his three books against Christianity,[7] at Antioch, where he bore the scoffs of the Christian populace with philosophical indifference. Not long after this he was killed in a battle with the Persians, in the year 363.[8]

§ 75.

GENERAL TOLERATION TILL THE YEAR 381.

Though Jovian was a zealous Christian, (+ 364) his reign was too short, and the times too tempestuous, to allow him to renew the laws which Constantius had enacted against Paganism.[1] Thus all religions were left unmolested, and continued so under the succeeding emperors, (Valentinian I. (+ 375)[2] and his sons Gratian and Valentinian II., in the West, and, in the East, Valens (+ 378)[3] and Theodosius,) till the year 381. Their reigns were too much disturbed by the irruptions of barbarians and the commotions of subjects, to allow them time for the persecution of Pagans. Still, Gratian was so zealous a Chris-

---

6 *Juliani* Epist. 25. — *Gregor. Nazianz.* orat. IV. *Chrysostomus* homil. III. adv. Judæos. *Ammianus Marcellinus* XXIII. 1. *Socrates* III. 20. *Sozom.* V. 22. *Theodoret.* III. 15. Comp. Michaelis on the vault under the temple-mountain, in Lichtenberg's and Förster's Götting. Magazin, 3tem Jahrg. (1783) S. 772. [Vid. Lard. J. & H. Test. IV. p. 57–71. Lond. 1767. — Tr.]

7 Fragments in Cyrilli Alexandr. adv. Julianum libb. X., published separately: Défense du Paganisme par l'empereur Julien, par M. *le Marquis d'Argens.* Berlin. 1704. ed. 3. 1769. 8vo. (comp. Rec. in Ernesti's R. Theol. Bibl. Th. 8. S. 551 ff.)

8 Comp. Ammianus Marcellinus XXV. 3, Eutropii breviar. X. 8., both of whom accompanied the expedition. — *Libanius* ἐπιτάφιος ἐπ' Ἰουλιανῷ (ed. Reiske vol. I. p. 614) hints that he was killed by a Christian. cf. Sozomenus VI. 1. 2. — *Juliani Imp. opera* (Orationes VIII. Cæsares, Μισοπώγων, Epistolæ 65.) *et Cyrilli contra impium Julianum* libb. X. ed. *Ezechiel Spanhemius*, Lips. 1696. fol.

1 *Themistii* oratio consularis ad Jovianum. On the other hand, Sozomenus VI. 3, Theodoretus V. 20, speak of measures against Paganism. Jovian also restored to the churches the σύνταξις τοῦ σίτου (comp. § 73, note 6. and § 74, note 3.) beginning with the restoration of only a third part on account of a prevailing scarcity. *Theodoret.* IV. 4.

2 *Cod. Theodos.* lib. IX. Tit. 16. L. 9, (A. D. 371): Haruspicinam ego nullum cum maleficiorum causis habere consortium judico, neque ipsam, aut aliquam præterea concessam a majoribus religionem genus esse arbitror criminis. Testes sunt leges a me in exordio imperii mei datæ, quibus unicuique, quod animo imbibisset, colendi libera facultas tributa est. Nec haruspicinam reprehendimus, sed nocenter exerceri vetamus. cf. *Ammian. Marcell.* XXX. 9. *Rudiger* de statu Pagan. p. 42 seq.

3 *Themistii* oratio ad Valentem XII. — Thereon see Socrat. IV. 32. Sozom. VI. 36. Theodoret. V. 20.

tian, that he, first of all the emperors, rejected the splendid attire of the Pontifex Maximus;[4] retaining the title, however, and being the last emperor who bore it.[5]

§ 76.

SUPPRESSION OF PAGANISM BY THEODOSIUS.

Vid. *Rüdiger* de statu Paganorum sub Impp. Christ. p. 47 seq.

As soon as Theodosius had secured the Eastern empire against the invasion of the Goths, he directed his chief attention to the suppression of Paganism. In the same year in which he summoned the second ecumenical council at Constantinople (A. D. 381), he forbade all apostasy to Paganism, and prohibited sacrifices,[1] though other heathen rites were still allowed. The two emperors of the West followed his example. Gratian commanded the altar of Victoria to be removed from the senate-house, and took away the privileges of the priests,[2] though he was obliged to suffer the forbidden sacrifices at Rome, as had been the case with Theodosius at Alexandria.[3] Gratian died soon after (A. D. 383), but his successor, Valentinian II., pursued the same course, and steadfastly withstood all the efforts of the heathen *Præfectus Urbis*, Q. Aurelius Symmachus (A. D. 384), to induce him to allow the altar of Victoria to be again erected.[4] In the East, however, the zeal of the Christians far outstripped the imperial ordinances.

---

4 *Zosimus*, IV. c. 36.

5 *J. A. Bosius* de pontificatu maximo Impp. præcipue Christianorum, in *Grævii thesaur. antiqu. Rom. T.* V. *p.* 271 *seq.*— *De la Bastie* du souverain pontificat des Empereurs Romains, in the *Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscr. T.* XV. *p.* 75 *seq.*— *Jos. Eckhel* doctr. numor. vett. Vol. 8. p. 386 seq.

1 *Cod. Theodos. Lib.* XVI. Tit. 7, L. 1: His, qui ex Christianis Pagani facti sunt, eripiatur facultas jusque testandi. Omne defuncti, si quod est, testamentum, submota conditione, rescindatur. Gratian and Valentinian gave the same orders, L. 3. (A. D. 382), in the West. — *Lib.* XVI. Tit. 10. L. 7. (381): Si qui vetitis sacrificiis, diurnis nocturnisque, velut vesanus ac sacrilegus incertorum consultor (animum) immerserit, fanumque sibi aut templum ad hujuscemodi sceleris excusationem assumendum crediderit, vel putaverit adeundum, proscriptioni se noverit subjugandum, cum nos justa institutione moneamus, castis Deum precibus excolendum, non diris carminibus profanandum.

2 victum modicum justaque privilegia, *Symmachus Lib.* X. *Ep.* 61. *Ambros. Ep.* 7.

3 *Libanius* ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερῶν (ed. Reiske, vol. II. p. 181): οὐ τοίνυν τῇ Ῥώμῃ μόνον ἐφυλάχθη τὸ θύειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ τοῦ Σαράπιδος, τῇ πολλῇ τε καὶ μεγάλῃ καὶ πλήθος κεκτημένῃ νεῶν, δι' ὧν κοινὴν ἁπάντων ἀνθρώπων ποιεῖ τὴν τῆς Αἰγύπτου φοράν. Αὐτὴ δὲ ἔργον τοῦ Νείλου, τὸν Νεῖλον δὲ ἑστιᾷ ἀναβαίνειν ἐπὶ τὰς ἀρούσας πείθουσα. ὧν οὐ ποιουμένων, ὅτε τε χρὴ, καὶ παρ' ὧν, οὐδ' ἂν αὐτὸς ἐθελήσειεν. ἃ μοι δοκοῦσιν εἰδότες οἱ καὶ ταῦτα ἂν ἡδέως ἀνελόντες οὐκ ἀνελεῖν, ἀλλ' ἀφεῖναι τὸν ποταμὸν εὐωχεῖσθαι τοῖς παλαιοῖς νομίμοις ἐπὶ μισθῷ τῷ εἰωθότι.

4 *Symmachi Epistolarum* (libb. X. ex rec. *Phil. Parei* Neostad. 1617. 4to. Francof. 1642. ed. III. 1651. 8vo.) *lib.* X. *Ep.* 61. Opposed by *Ambrosii* epist. 17 and 18 ad Valentinianum. Somewhat later *Prudentius* adv. Symmachum libb II.

Mobs of hirelings and fanatics were led against the heathen temples by the more enterprising bishops;[5] and the monks, especially, often banded themselves together for the destruction of the heathen relics.[6] The eloquent appeal of Libanius to Theodosius *ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερῶν* (A. D. 388 – 390) was in vain; the Heathen were almost directly afterwards forbidden to visit the temples;[7] and, at length, the destruction of the splendid temple of Serapis (A. D. 391)[8] by the furious Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, after a bloody contest, announced the total overthrow of Paganism in the Eastern empire.

When, at length, Theodosius became sole master of the Roman empire, by the death of Valentinian II., (A. D. 392), his first measure

---

5 Thus Eulogius, bishop of Edessa (vid. *Libanius* pro templis, ed. Reiske, vol II. p. 192 seq. *Gothofredus* ad *Cod. Theod.* XVI. 10, 8vo): Marcellus, bishop of Apamea *(Sozom.* VII. 15. *Theodoret.* V. 21); but especially Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, see note 8. *Rüdiger*, l. c. p. 58 seq.

6 *Libanius* *ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερῶν* (ed. Reiske, vol. II. p. 164): *σὺ μὲν οὖν οὔθ' ἱερὰ κεκλεῖσθαι* (ἐκέλευσας), *οὔτε μηδένα προσσίναι· οὔτε πῦρ, οὔτε λιβανωτὸν, οὔτε τὰς ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων θυμιαμάτων τιμὰς ἐξῄλασας τῶν νεῶν, οὐδὲ τῶν βωμῶν. οἱ δὲ μειλανιμονοῦντες οὔτοι καὶ πλείω μὲν τῶν ἐλειφάντων ἐσθίοντες, πόνον δὲ παρέχοντες τῷ πλήθει τῶν ἐκπωμάτων τοῖς δ' ἀσμάτων αὐτοῖς παρατέμπουσι τὸ ποτόν, συγκρύπτοντες δὲ ταῦτα ὠχρότητι τῇ διὰ τέχνης αὐτοῖς πεπορισμένῃ, μένοντες, ὦ βασιλεῦ, καὶ κρατοῦντος τοῦ νόμου, θέουσιν ἐφ' ἱερὰ, ξύλα φέροντες καὶ λίθους καὶ σιδηρὸν, οἱ δὲ καὶ ἄνευ τούτων, χεῖρας καὶ πόδας. ἔπειτα Μυσῶν λεῖα καθαιρουμένων ὀροφῶν, κατασκαπτομένων τοίχων, κατασπωμένων ἀγαλμάτων, ἀνασπωμένων βωμῶν· τοὺς ἱερεῖς δὲ ἢ σιγᾶν, ἢ τεθνᾶναι δεῖ. τῶν πρώτων δὲ κειμένων, δρόμος ἐπὶ τὰ δεύτερα καὶ τρίτα. καὶ τρόπαια τροπαίοις ἐναντία τῷ νόμῳ συνείρεται. τολμᾶται μὲν οὖν κᾶν ταῖς πόλεσιν, τὸ πολὺ δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἀγροῖς* — p. 168. *ἐστὶ δὲ οὗτος ὁ πόλεμος πόρος τῶν μὲν τοῖς ναοῖς ἐγκειμένων, τῶν δὲ τὰ ὄντα τοῖς παλαιπώροις (γεωργοῖς) ἀρταζόντων, τά τε κείμενα αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἃ τρέφουσιν, ὥστ' ἀπέρχονται φέροντες οἱ ἐπελθόντες τὰ τῶν ἐκπεσολιορκηθέντων. τοῖς δ' οὐκ ἀρκεῖ ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ καὶ γῆν σφετερίζονται, τὴν τοῦ δείνος ἱερὰν εἶναι λέγοντες, καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν πατρῴων ἐστέρηνται δι' ὀνόματος οὐκ ἀληθοῦς. οἱ δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἑτέρων τεμφῶσι κακῶν, οἱ τῷ πεινῇν, ὥς φασι, τὸν αὐτῶν θεραπεύοντες θεόν. ἢν δὲ οἱ πεπορθημένοι παρὰ τὸν ἐν ἄστει τοιμένα (καλοῦσι γὰρ οὗτοι ἄνδρα οὐ πάνυ χρηστὸν), ἢν οἷν ἐλθόντες ὀδύρωνται, λέγοντες ἃ ἠδίκηνται, ὁ τοιμὴν οὗτος τοὺς μὲν ἐπήνεσε, τοὺς δὲ ἀπήλασεν, ὡς ἐν τῷ μὴ μείζω πεπονθέναι κεκερδακότας. καίτοι τῆς μὲν σῆς ἀρχῆς, ὦ βασιλεῦ, καὶ οὗτοι, τοσούτῳ δὲ χρησιμώτεροι τῶν ἀδικούντων αὐτοὺς, ὅσῳ τῶν ἀργούντων οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ταῖς μελίτταις, οἱ δὲ τοῖς κηφῆσιν ἐοίκασι. κᾶν ἀκούσωσιν ἄγγελόν τι ἔχειν τι τῶν ἀρπασθῆναι δυναμένων, εὐθὺς οὗτος ἐν θυσίαις τί ἐστι, καὶ δεινὰ ποιεῖ, καὶ δεῖ στρατείας ἐπ' αὐτὸν, καὶ πάρεισιν οἱ σωφρονισταὶ, κ. τ. λ.* cf. *Theodoretus*, V. 21.

7 Valentinian's law for the West, dated 27 Feb. 391. *Cod. Theodos.* XVI. 10, 10: Nemo se hostiis polluat, nemo insontem victimam cædat, nemo delubra adeat, templa perlustret, et mortali opere formata simulacra suscipiat. — Judices quoque hanc formam contineant, ut si quis — templum uspiam — adoraturus intraverit, quindecim pondo auri ipse protinus inferre cogatur. — The same was decreed in the West by Theodosius L. II, 17 June, A. D. 391.

8 *Socrates*, V. 16. *Sozom.* VII. 15. *Theodoret.* V. 22. *Eunapius* in vita Ædesii, ed. Schotti p. 63 seq. *Zosimus* V. 23: especially *Rufinus*, who was at the time in Palestine, *hist. eccl.* XI. 22 – 30. Various impositions of the priests were thus detected; *Theodor. l. c. Rufinus* l. c. 23 – 25: the Heathen were more especially impressed by the disappointment of their expectations, quod si humana manus simulacrum illud (Serapis) contigisset, terra dehiscens ilico solveretur in chaos, cœlumque repente rueret in præceps (*Rufin.* l. c. 23), as well as of the fear, Serapin injuriæ memorem aquas ultra et affluentiam solitam non largiturum *(Rufin.* l. c. 30. cf. *Libanius*, see note 3), the destruction of the temple being followed by an ample inundation.

was to forbid the worship of idols on pain of death:[9] and soon after (A. D. 394), on occasion of a visit to Rome, where the worship of the heathen Gods was still, in some measure, allowed, he succeeded in bringing over a part of the senate and people to the Christian faith, by his eloquence.[10]

---

[9] Cod. Theodos. XVI. 10, 12. *Impp. Theodosius, Arcadius, et Honorius AA. ad Rufinum Pf. P:* Nullus omnino, ex quolibet genere, ordine hominum, dignitatum, vel in potestate positus, vel honore perfunctus, sive potens sorte nascendi, seu humilis genere, conditione, fortuna, in nullo penitus loco, in nulla urbe, sensu carentibus simulacris vel insontem victimam cædat, vel secretiore piaculo larem igne, mero genium, penates nidore veneratus, accendat lumina, imponat thura, serta suspendat. § 1. Quodsi quispiam immolare hostiam sacrificaturus audebit, aut spirantia exta consulere, ad exemplum majestatis reus licita cunctis accusatione delatus, excipiat sententiam competentem, etiamsi nihil contra salutem principum, aut de salute quæsierit. Sufficit enim ad criminis molem, naturæ ipsius leges velle rescindere, illicita perscrutari, occulta recludere, interdicta tentare, finem quærere salutis alienæ, spem alieni interitus polliceri. § 2. Si quis vero mortali opere facta et ævum passura simulacra imposito thure venerabitur, ac, ridiculo exemplo metuens subito, quæ ipse simulaverit, vel redimita vittis arbore, vel erecta effossis ara cespitibus vanas imagines, humiliore licet muneris præmio, tamen plena religionis injuria honorare tentaverit, is, utpote violatæ religionis reus, ea domo seu possessione multabitur, in qua eum gentilitia constiterit superstitione famulatum. Namque omnia loca, quæ thuris constiterit vapore fumasse (si tamen ea in jure fuisse thurificantium probabuntur) fisco nostro associanda censemus. § 3. Sin vero in templis fanisve publicis, aut in ædibus agrisve alienis tale quispiam sacrificandi genus exercere tentaverit, si ignorante domino usurpata constiterit, XXV. librarum auri mulctæ nomine cogetur inferre, conniventem vero huic sceleri par ac sacrificantem pœna retinebit. § 4. Quod quidem ita per judices ac defensores et curiales singularum urbium volumus custodiri, ut illico per hos comperta in judicium deferantur, per illos delata plectantur. Si quid autem ii tegendum gratia aut incuria prætermittendum esse crediderint, commotioni judiciariæ subjacebunt. Illi vero moniti si vindictam dissimulatione distulerint, XXX. librarum auri dispendio mulctabuntur: officiis quoque eorum damno parili subjugandis. *Dat.* VI. *Id. Nov. Constantinopoli, Arcadio A.* II. *et Rufino Coss.*

[10] Comp. the narration *Prudent. in Symmachum* I. 409 scq. especially verse 609 seq.

Adspice, quam pleno subsellia nostra senatu
Decernant, infame Jovis pulvinar et omne
Idolium, longe purgata ex urbe fugandum:
Qua vocat egregii sententia principis, illuc
Libera tum pedibus, tum corde frequentia transit.

A different account, and one agreeing better with after events, (see § 77, notes 8 and 10.), is given by *Zosimus*, IV. 59: Μηδενὸς δὲ τῇ παρακλήσει πείσθεντος, μηδὲ ἱλομένου τῶν ἀφ' οὗπερ ἡ πόλις ᾠκίσθη παραδιδομένων αὐτοῖς πατρίων ἀναχωρῆσαι, καὶ προτιμῆσαι τούτων ἅλεγον συγκαπάθεσιν (ἐκεῖνα μὲν γὰρ φυλάξαντας ἤδη διακοσίοις καὶ χιλίοις σχεδὸν ἔτεσιν ἀπόρθητον τὴν πόλιν οἰκεῖν· ἕτερα δὲ ἀντὶ τούτων ἀλλαξαμένους τὸ ἐκβησόμενον ἀγνοεῖν)· τότε δὴ ὁ Θεοδόσιος βαρύνεσθαι τὸ δημόσιον ἔλεγε τῇ περὶ τὰ ἱερὰ καὶ τὰς θυσίας δαπάνῃ, βούλεσθαί τε ταῦτα περιελεῖν, κ. τ. λ. But, V. 38: Ὅτε Θεοδόσιος ὁ πρεσβύτης, τὴν Εὐγενίου καθελὼν πυραυνίδα, τὴν Ῥώμην κατέλαβε, καὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς ἁγιστείας ἐνεποίησε πᾶσιν ὀλιγωρίαν, τὴν δημοσίαν δαπάνην τοῖς ἱεροῖς χορηγεῖν ἀρνησάμενος, ἀπηλαύνοντο μὲν ἱερεῖς καὶ ἱέρειαι, κατελιμπάνετο δὲ πάσης ἱερουργίας τὰ τεμένη.

§ 77.

PAGANISM ENTIRELY SUPPRESSED IN THE EAST. ITS STRUGGLES IN THE WEST.

Rüdiger l. c. p. 70 seq.

In the Eastern Roman empire (Arcadius A. D. 395 – 408, Theodosius II. till the year 450), which was less disturbed from without, the ordinances against Paganism could be more strictly observed.[1] Bands of monks went around in the provinces under the imperial protection, effacing all traces of heathen idolatry,[2] and perpetrating, with impunity, the most outrageous acts: of which we have an instance in the cruel murder of Hypatia, at Alexandria, in the year 416.[3] The New-Platonic philosophers at Athens, and amongst them the celebrated Proclus († A. D. 485),[4] were forced to conceal themselves for safety; and as early as the year 423, no trace of Paganism was visible in the Eastern empire.[5]

But the case was widely different in the West, under the emperors Honorius (A. D. 395 – 423), and Valentinian III. (till the year 455), where the devastation of Italy, and the inundation of the provinces by hordes of barbarians, were loudly attributed by the Heathen to the neglect of the ancient worship.[6] Here, the emperors found it expe-

---

1 *Cod. Theod.* XVI. 10, 13 seq. By L. 14 the privileges of the priests were taken from them.

2 So Chrysostom (*Theodoret.* V. 29): *μαθὼν τὴν Φοινίκην ἔτι περὶ τὰς τῶν δαιμόνων τελετὰς μεμηνέναι, ἀσκηπτὰς μὲν ζήλῳ θείῳ πυροπολουμένους συνέλεξε, νόμοις δὲ αὐτοὺς ὁπλίσας βασιλικοῖς, κατὰ τῶν εἰδωλικῶν ἐξέπεμψε τεμένων.* These laws are without doubt, *Cod. Theod.* XVI. 10, 16, A. D. 399: Si qua in agris templa sunt, sine turba ac tumultu diruantur cf. *Chyrsostomi Epistt.* 28, 51, 53, 54, 55, 59, 69, 123, 126, 221. Neander's Chrysostomus, Bd. 2, S. 48, 257.

3 Socrates VII. 15. Damascius ap. Suidam s. v. Hypatia.

4 Vita *Procli* scriptore *Marino* ed. *J. A. Fabricius.* Hamb. 1700. 8vo. — His 18 *ἐπιχειρήματα κατὰ Χριστιανῶν* are contained and disproved in *Johannis Philoponi* libb. 18 de æternitate mundi (græce ex Trincavelli officina. Venet. 1535. fol. lat. vert. *Joh. Mahatius.* Lugd. 1557. fol.)

5 Theodosius II. in Cod. Theodos. XVI. 10, 22 (A. D. 423): Paganos, qui supersunt, quanquam jam nullos esse credamus, promulgatarum legum jamdudum præscripta compescant.

6 *Zosimus* IV. 59: *τοῦ θυηπολικοῦ θεσμοῦ λήξαντος, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, ὅσα τῆς πατρίου παραδόσεως ἦν, ἐν ἀμελείᾳ κειμένων, ἡ Ρωμαίων ἐπικράτεια κατὰ μέρος ἐλαττωθεῖσα, βαρβάρων οἰκητήριον γέγονε, ἢ καὶ πλέον ἐκτισοῦσα τῶν οἰκητόρων εἰς τοῦτο κατέστη σχήματος, ὥστε μηδὲ τοὺς τόπους, ἐν οἷς γεγόνασιν αἱ πόλεις, ἐπιγινώσκειν.* The extraordinary events of the time led men to expect things still more extraordinary. *Philastr. hær.* 106: Alia est hæresis de anno annunciato ambigenz, quod ait Propheta Esaias: *Annuntiare annum Dei acceptabilem et diem retributionis.* Putant ergo quidam, quod ex quo venit Dominus usque ad consummationem sæculi non plus nec minus fieri annorum numerum, nisi CCCLXV. usque ad Christi Domini iterum de cœlo divinam præsentiam. A new turn was given to this tradition of the Christians by the heathen. *Augustin. de civ.* Dei XVIII. 53:

dient to restrain the zeal of the Christians from the destruction of the temples; [7] and though they continued to enact laws against idolatrous worship, they were not always able to insist upon their strict enforcement.[8] Notwithstanding the laborious efforts of Augustine and Orosius, to show the injustice of attributing the incursions of the barbarians to the introduction of Christianity,[9] the secret worship of the

---

Excogitaverunt nescio quos versus Græcos tanquam consulenti cuidam divino oraculo effusos, ubi Christum quidem ab hujus tanquam sacrilegii crimine faciunt innocentem: Petrum autem maleficia fecisse subjungunt (namely, scelere magico puer, ut dicunt, anniculus occisus, et dilaniatus, et ritu nefario sepultus est), ut coleretur Christi nomen per CCCLXV. annos, deinde completo memorato numero annorum sine mora sumeret finem.

7 Which was begun especially by Martin, bishop of Tours, A. D. 375 – 400, with violent opposition on the part of the Heathen. vid. *Sulpic. Severus de vita b. Martini*, c. 13 – 15. The African bishops also resolved at the *Conc. Africanum*, A. D. 399, to petition the Emperor, *Can.* 25 (*Cod. Eccl. Afric.* c. 58. *Mansi* III. p. 766): ut reliquias idolorum per totam Africam jubeant penitus amputari, — et templa eorum, quæ in agris vel in locis abditis constituta nullo ornamento sunt, jubeantur omnimodo destrui. *Can.* 27. (*Cod. Afric.* c. 60): ut quoniam contra præcepta divina convivia multis in locis exercentur, quæ ab errore gentili attracta sunt, — vetari talia jubeant, etc. But Honorius enacted two laws, in the course of the same year, of quite a different character. *Cod. Theodos. Lib.* XVI. *Tit.* 10. *L.* 17: Ut profanos ritus jam salubri lege submovimus, ita festos conventus civium et communem omnium lætitiam non patimur submoveri. L. 18: Ædes, inlicitis rebus vacuas, nostrarum beneficio sanctionum, ne quis conetur evertere.

8 When Rome was besieged by Alaric, A. D. 409 (*Sozom.* IX. 6): ἀναγκαῖον ἐδόκει τοῖς ἑλληνίζουσι τῆς συγκλήτου, θύειν ἐν τῷ Καπιτωλίῳ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ναοῖς. *Zosimus*, V. 14 adds: ὁ δὲ Ἰνοκέντιος τὴν τῆς πόλεως σωτηρίαν ἔμπροσθεν τῆς οἰκείας ποιησάμενος δόξης, λάθρα ἐρῆκεν αὐτοῖς ποιεῖν ἅπερ ἴσασιν. — In the year 408, Honorius had enacted *Cod. Theod.* XVI. 5. 42: Eos qui Catholicæ sectæ sunt inimici, intra palatium militare prohibemus. Nullus nobis sit aliqua ratione conjunctus, qui a nobis fide et religione discordat. But when afterwards he wished to give the command in Rhætia to the Heathen Generidus he refused to accept it, ἕως ὁ βασιλεὺς, αἴδοῖ τε ἅμα καὶ χρείᾳ συνωθούμενος, ἔπαυσεν ἐπὶ πᾶσι τὸν νόμον, ἀποδοὺς ἑκάστῳ, τῆς αὐτοῦ ὄντι δόξης, ἄρχειν τε καὶ στρατεύεσθαι. *Zosimus*, V. 46.

9 *Augustin. retractat.* II. 43. Interea Roma Gothorum irruptione agentium sub rege Alarico, atque impetu magnæ cladis eversa est, cujus eversionem deorum falsorum multorumque cultores, quos usitato nomine Paganos vocamus, in Christianam religionem referre conantes, solito acerbius et amarius Deum rerum blasphemare cœperunt. Unde ergo exardescens zelo domus Dei, adversus eorum blasphemias vel errores libros *de civitate Dei* scribere institui. — Hoc autem *de civitate Dei* grande opus tandem XXII. libris est terminatum. Quorum *quinque primi* eos refellunt, qui res humanas ita prosperari volunt, ut ad hoc multorum deorum cultum, quos Pagani colere consueverunt, necessarium esse arbitrentur: et quia prohibetur, mala ista exoriri atque abundare contendunt. Sequentes autem *quinque* adversus eos loquuntur, qui fatentur hæc mala nec defuisse unquam, nec defutura mortalibus, et ea nunc magna, nunc parva, locis, temporibus, personisque variari, sed deorum multorum cultum, quo eis sacrificatur, propter vitam post mortem futuram esse utilem disputant. His ergo decem libris duæ istæ vanæ opiniones Christianæ religioni adversariæ refelluntur. Sed ne quisquam nos aliena tantum redarguisse, non autem nostra asseruisse reprehenderet, id agit *pars altera* operis hujus, quæ libris XII. continetur. — Duodecim ergo librorum sequentium *primi quatuor* continent exortum duarum civitatum, quarum est una Dei, altera hujus mundi. *Secundi quatuor* excursum earum sive procursum. *Tertii* vero, qui et prostremi, debitos fines. — *Augustini de Civitate Dei, libb.* XXII. *cum commentario Jo. Lud. Vivis. Basil.* 1522. fol. *cum comm. Leon. Coquæi. Paris.* 1636. fol. *cum comm. Vivis et Coquæi sumt. Zach. Hertelii Hamburg.* 1661. 2 Tom. 4to. — *Pauli Orosii adversus Paganos historiarum libb.* VII. *rec. et illustr. Sigeb. Havercampus. Lugd. Bat.* 1738. 4to.

Gods was kept up (though for the most part mingled with Christianity), till after the period now before us.[10]

CHAPTER SECOND.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

J. C. F. Wundemann Gesch. d. christ. Glaubenslehren vom Zeitalter des Athanasius bis auf Gregor d. G. 2 Theile. Leipz. 1798. 8vo. Münscher's Dogmengeschichte, Bd. 3, 4.

§ 78.

INTRODUCTION.

In the beginning of this century the universally received articles of the Christian faith were few and simple, leaving ample room for different interpretations and the exercise of private judgment. How different were the various systems thereupon founded, may be seen by a comparison of the different schools which were now in existence, — the speculative school of Origen, the traditional, and the historico-critical school, which was, as yet, in its infancy. And even a greater contrast of systems was to be expected, from the speculative turn of the Greek Christians, which the cessation of the persecutions now left them free to indulge.

Thus theological controversies became unavoidable; nor would this have been matter of regret, or have exerted any but a favorable influence, if the old distinction between πίστις and γνῶσις had only been steadily kept in view, and points of theology not made matters of religion, and church discipline. But the very simplicity of the old articles of faith, tempted the disputants on either side to appeal to them, each, according to his own interpretation, accusing the other of heresy. This at once brought the question before the hierarchy, who claimed the exclusive right of deciding upon all questions of faith, and were always ready to seize upon any opportunity thus afforded them of interfering in the mere theological disputes of the day. And this tendency to pursue their own interest, they were now at less pains to

---

10 In Rome, certain heathen practices of a supposed political importance were kept up long after the whole city had become Christian. vid. *Salvianus Massil.* (about 440) *de gubernatione Dei*, VI. c. 2: Numquid non Consulibus et pulli adhuc gentilium sacrilegiorum more pascuntur, et volantis pennæ auguria quæruntur, ac pene omnia fiunt quæ etiam illi quondam pagani veteres frivola atque inridenda duxerunt? — hæc propter Consules tantum fiunt.

disguise, inasmuch as they were left more free from the necessity of struggling against Paganism, and were at the same time supported by the strong arm of the state.

Thus the religious controversies soon assumed a new character. Formerly, they were confined to particular provinces; but now they divided the whole Christian world. To end them, the emperors called general councils (σύνοδοι οἰκουμενικαὶ), whose decisions became the laws of the realm, and were enforced by the civil power. Formerly, the councils, which were assembled to judge of heretics, contented themselves with guarding against innovation; but now, the general councils, invested with the highest ecclesiastical dignity, and supported by the imperial power, went on to erect their decisions on disputed points into positive articles of faith.* All this contributed to develope the system of doctrines with great rapidity, whilst the freedom of speculation had proportionably narrowed. At the same time the condemned parties were provoked to greater obstinacy, and the schisms in the church became wider and more incurable. These contests not only had an important effect on the developement of the internal relations of the church, but, from the share taken in them by the emperors, were also of great political moment. So that from this time forward, not only the whole history of the church, but often, also, the political history of the Roman empire, turns on the theological controversies.

I. Arian Controversy.

Walch's Historie der Ketzereien, Th. 2. S. 385 ff. — J. A. Stark Versuch einer Geschichte d. Arianismus. Berlin. 1783-85. 2 Th. 8vo. — J. C. F. Wundemann's Geschichte der christ. Glaubenslehren vom Zeitalter des Athanasius bis auf Gregor d. Grossen. (Leipzig. 1798-99. 2 Th. 8vo.) Th. 1. S. 264 ff. Münscher's Dogmengeschichte, Bd. 3. S. 351 ff.

§ 79.

BEGINNING OF THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY TO THE SYNOD OF NICE, (A. D. 325.)

Storia critica della vita di Ario, scritta da *Gaetano Maria Travasa*, Cler. Reg. Teatino. Venezia, 1746. 8vo.

In the midst of the ineffectual attempts to bring back the Donatians and Miletians to the true church, there burst forth suddenly a new controversy, which soon assumed an importance far greater than any that had ever preceded it. Throughout the third century, theologians had been speculating on the relation of the Son to the Father, but had never attained to clear and uniform views on the subject. The

* Hilarius de Trinitate, II. 1.

followers of Origen, in particular, had been led, in their various investigations (see § 61), to results entirely irreconcilable with each other, as they must themselves have perceived, but for the obscure nature of the subject.

This was the state of things when Arius, a presbyter of Alexandria, and a pupil of the historico-critical school of Lucian, where he acquired his love of clearness and precision, took up the one side of Origen's theory, namely, that the Son is a subordinate being, created by the Father, and carried it out in all its particulars, — rejecting entirely Origen's other position, which is in fact contradictory to this, that the Son was begotten from all eternity.[1] This brought on a

---

1 Writings of Arius: *Epist. ad Eusebium Nicomediensem* in Epiphan. hær. 69, § 6, and Theodoret. hist. eccl. 1, 4, *Epist. ad Alexandrum*, in Athanasius de synodis Arim. et Seleuc. c. 16, and Epiphanius hær. 69, § 7, Θαλεία (ἐμφέρεις τῇ χαυνότητι τοῖς Σωτάδου ἄσμασιν, Sozom. 1, 21) no longer extant, excepting in a few fragments in the writings of Athanasius. — The explanations of Arius are found *Epist. ad Eusch.*: ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς οὐκ ἔστιν ἀγέννητος, οὐδὲ μέρος ἀγεννήτου κατ' οὐδένα τρόπον, οὐδὲ ἐξ ὑποκειμένου τινός· ἀλλ' ὅτι θελήματι καὶ βουλῇ ὑπέστη πρὸ χρόνων καὶ πρὸ αἰώνων πλήρης θεός, μονογενής, ἀναλλοίωτος, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῇ, ἤτοι κτισθῇ, ἢ ὁρισθῇ, ἢ θεμελιωθῇ, οὐκ ἦν· ἀγέννητος γὰρ οὐκ ἦν. διωκόμεθα, ὅτι εἴπαμεν, ἀρχὴν ἔχει ὁ υἱός, ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἄναρχός ἐστι. διὰ τοῦτο διωκόμεθα. καὶ ὅτι εἴπαμεν, ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐστίν. οὕτω δὲ εἴπαμεν, καθότι οὐδὲ μέρος θεοῦ, οὐδὲ ἐξ ὑποκειμένου τινός. *Epist. ad Alex.*: οἴδαμεν ἕνα θεὸν, μόνον ἀγέννητον —, τοῦτον θεὸν γεννήσαντα υἱὸν μονογενῆ πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, δι' οὗ καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ πεποίηκε. γεννήσαντα δὲ οὐ δοκήσει, ἀλλ' ἀληθείᾳ, ὑποστήσαντα δὲ ἰδίῳ θελήματι, ἄτρεπτον καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον, κτίσμα τοῦ θεοῦ τέλειον, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἓν τῶν κτισμάτων, γέννημα, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἓν τῶν γεννημάτων, οὐδ' ὡς Οὐαλεντῖνος προβολὴν τὸ γέννημα τοῦ πατρὸς ἐδογμάτισεν, οὐδ' ὡς ὁ Μανιχαῖος μέρος ὁμοουσίου τοῦ πατρὸς τὸ γέννημα εἰσηγήσατο, οὐδ' ὡς Σαβέλλιος τὴν μονάδα διαιρῶν, υἱοπάτορα εἶπεν, οὐδ' ὡς Ἱεράκας λύχνον ἀπὸ λύχνου, ἢ ὡς λαμπάδα εἰς δύο, οὐδὲ τὸν ὄντα πρότερον, ὕστερον γεννηθέντα, ἢ ἐπικτισθέντα εἰς υἱόν· — ἀλλ', ὡς φαμὲν, θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸ χρόνων καὶ πρὸ αἰώνων κτισθέντα, καὶ τὸ ζῆν καὶ τὸ εἶναι παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς εἰληφότα, καὶ τὰς δόξας συνυποστήσαντος αὐτῷ τοῦ πατρός. οὐ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ, δοὺς αὐτῷ πάντων τὴν κληρονομίαν, ἐστέρησεν ἑαυτὸν, ὧν ἀγεννήτως ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ· πηγὴ γάρ ἐστι πάντων. Ὅσοι τρεῖς εἰσιν ὑποστάσεις, καὶ ὁ μὲν θεὸς αἴτιος τῶν πάντων τυγχάνων, ἔστιν ἄναρχος μονώτατος. ὁ δὲ υἱὸς ἀχρόνως γεννηθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ πρὸ αἰώνων κτισθεὶς καὶ θεμελιωθεὶς, οὐκ ἦν πρὸ τοῦ γεννηθῆναι· — οὐδὲ γάρ ἐστιν ἀΐδιος, ἢ συναΐδιος, ἢ συναγέννητος τῷ πατρί. — εἰ δὲ τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ ἐκ γαστρὸς, καὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἥκω, ὡς μέρος αὐτοῦ ὁμοουσίου, καὶ ὡς προβολὴ ὑπό τινων νοεῖται, σύνθετος ἔσται ὁ πατὴρ καὶ διαίρετος, καὶ τρεπτὸς, καὶ σῶμα κατ' αὐτοὺς, καὶ τὸ ὅσον ἐσ' αὐτοῖς τὰ ἀκόλουθα σώματι πάσχων, ὁ ἀσώματος θεός. From the Thaleia (Athanas. contra Arianos Orat. 1. c. 9): οὐκ ἀεὶ ὁ θεὸς πατὴρ ἦν, ἀλλ' ὕστερον γέγονεν· οὐκ ἀεὶ ἦν ὁ υἱὸς, οὐ γὰρ ἦν, πρὶν γεννηθῇ· οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, ἀλλ' ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ὑπέστη καὶ αὐτός· οὐκ ἔστιν ἴδιος τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας, κτίσμα γάρ ἐστι καὶ ποίημα. καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθινὸς θεὸς ὁ Χριστός, ἀλλὰ μετοχῇ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐθεοποιήθη· οὐκ οἶδε τὸν πατέρα ἀκριβῶς ὁ υἱὸς, οὔτε ὁρᾷ ὁ λόγος τὸν πατέρα τελείως, καὶ οὔτε συνιεῖ, οὔτε γινώσκει ἀκριβῶς ὁ λόγος τὸν πατέρα· οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς καὶ μόνος αὐτὸς τοῦ πατρὸς λόγος, ἀλλ' ὀνόματι μόνον λέγεται λόγος καὶ σοφία, καὶ χάριτι λέγεται υἱὸς καὶ δύναμις· οὐκ ἔστιν ἄτρεπτος, ὡς ὁ πατὴρ, ἀλλὰ τρεπτός ἐστι φύσει, ὡς τὰ κτίσματα, καὶ λείπει αὐτῷ εἰς κατάληψιν τοῦ γνῶναι τελείως τὸν πατέρα. Concerning the τρεπτότης he says in a fragment contained in the same orat. II: τῇ μὲν φύσει, ὥσπερ πάντες, οὕτως καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ λόγος ἐστὶ τρεπτὸς, τῷ δὲ ἰδίῳ αὐτεξουσίῳ, ἕως βούλεται, μένει καλὸς, ὅτι μένει θέλει, δύναται τρέπεσθαι καὶ αὐτὸς ὥσπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς, τρεπτὸς ὢν φύσει. Διὰ τοῦτο γάρ, φησι, καὶ προγινώσκων ὁ θεὸς ἔσεσθαι καλὸν αὐτὸν, προλαβὼν ταύτην αὐτῷ τὴν δόξαν ἔδωκεν, ἣν ἂν καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἔσχε μετὰ ταῦτα. Münters Dogmengesch. Bd. 1. S. 448 ff.

controversy with his bishop, Alexander, (from A. D. 318,) who expelled him from the church, with all his followers. Many of the bishops in Syria now declared for Arius; some, and in particular Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, directly adopting his views; and others, as, for instance, Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea,* maintaining that his doctrine was at least not irreconcilable with the common faith of the church. The most distinguished defender of the Arian doctrines was the sophist Asterius, of Cappadocia, who was also a pupil of Lucian. (+ about A. D. 330.)[2] This controversy now divided the whole Eastern church. Constantine, having attempted in vain to induce the opposite parties to give up the disputed point,[3] at last called a general council at Nice (A. D. 325.) As the number of Arian bishops present was much smaller than that of their opponents, the decision was in favor of Alexander, whose cause was defended by *Athanasius*, Diaconus at Alexandria, and *Marcellus*, bishop of Ancyra. It was established as the creed of the church, that the Son was created from the essence of the Father, and was of the same essence as the Father, and the doctrines of Arius were anathematized.[4] As Constantine threatened banishment to all who did not sign this decree, none refused excepting the two Egyptian bishops, Theonas and Secundus, who, with Arius, were banished to Illyria. The decrees of this council were proclaimed as imperial laws, and the departure from them, as in the case of Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, and Theognis, bishop of Nice, punished with exile (A. D. 325).

---

* Vid. the fragment of his letter to Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, in the Acts of the Council of Nice, II. ann. 787, Actio VI. in Mansi XIII. p. 316.

2 Fragments of his σύνταγμα in Athanasius.

3 Epist. Constantini ad Alexandrum et Arium in Eusebii vit. Const. II. 64 — 72. Also c. 69: οὔτε ἐρωτᾶν ὑπὲρ τῶν τοιούτων ἐξ ἀρχῆς προσῆκον ἦν, οὔτε ἐρωτώμενον ἀποκρίνεσθαι. τὰς γὰρ τοιαύτας ζητήσεις, ὁπόσας μὴ νόμου τινὸς ἀνάγκη προσάπτει, ἀλλ' ἀνωφελοῦς ἀργίας ἐρεσχελία προσπίθησιν, εἰ καὶ φυσικῆς τινὸς γυμνασίας ἕνεκα γίγνοιτο, ὅμως ἀφίλομαι εἴσω τῆς διανοίας ἐγκλείειν, καὶ μὴ πρεχείρως εἰς δημοσίας συνόδους ἐκφέρειν, μηδὲ παῖς τῶν δήμων ἀκοαῖς ἀπρονοήτως πιστεύειν. — c. 70: Διόπερ καὶ ἐρώτησις ἀπροφύλακτος, καὶ ἀπόκρισις ἀπρονόητος ἴσην ἀλλήλαις ἀντιδοῦσαν ἐφ' ἑκατέρῳ συγγνώμην. — c. 71: Καὶ λέγω ταῦτα, οὐχ ὡς ἀναγκάζων ὑμᾶς ἐξάπαντος τῇ λίαν εὐνοεῖσθαι, καὶ οἷα δή ποτέ ἐστιν ἐκείνη ἡ ζήτησις, συντίθεσθαι. δύναται γὰρ καὶ τὸ τῆς συνόδου τίμιον ὑμῖν ἀκεραίως σῴζεσθαι, καὶ μία καὶ ἡ αὐτὴ κατὰ πάντων κοινωνία τηρεῖσθαι, κἂν τὰ μάλιστά τις ἐν μέρει πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὑμῖν ὑπὲρ ἐλαχίστου διαφωνία γένηται.

4 The history of the Council of Nice, written by *Maruthas*, bishop of Tagrit, at the end of the fourth century (vid. *Assemanni Bibl. Orient.* T. I. p. 195.), is no longer extant. *Gelasii Cyziceni* (bishop of Cæsarea, in Palestine, about A. D. 476,) σύνταγμα τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἐν Νικαίᾳ ἁγίαν σύνοδον πραχθέντων, libb. 3, (the third is lost), prim. ed. *Rob. Balsorcus Scotus*. Paris. 1600. 8vo. also contained in the collection of decrees of councils, *Mansi*, II. p. 759. — *Th. Ittigii* historia Concilii Nicæni (ed. *Christianus Ludovici*). Lips. 1712. 4to. *Symbolum Nicænum* (cf. Chr. G. F. Walchii bibliotheca symbolica vetus. Lemgov. 1770. 8vo. p 75 seq.): Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεόν, πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁράτων τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν. Καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆ, τουτέστιν, ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα, οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί. δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τά τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τά ἐν τῇ γῇ. τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα, καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, παθόντα καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ

§ 80.

RESISTANCE OF THE EUSEBIANS TO THE DECREES OF THE COUNCIL OF NICE: — TILL THE SECOND COUNCIL AT SIRMIUM (A. D. 357.)

The decrees of the council of Nice met with much opposition in the East, partly because men objected to the use of the Sabellian term ὁμοούσιος, (*of the same essence,*) and partly because they thought it wrong to introduce into the creed of the church such minute distinctions on a subject hitherto left free. Constantine himself was at length won over to this view. The banished were recalled, and not only the bishops Eusebius and Theognis, but even Arius, his orthodoxy being acknowledged by the emperor, on his giving in a public confession of faith, expressed in general terms. Eusebius of Nicomedia, having now obtained a decided influence over the emperor, many of those bishops, who obstinately adhered to the decrees of the council of Nice, and refused to enter into communion with the recalled bishops, were banished, particularly Eustathius of Antioch (A. D. 331).[1] Athanasius himself, now bishop of Alexandria, was displaced by a council held at Tyre (A. D. 335), and banished to Gaul by Constantine, and Arius was received solemnly into the church-communion at Jerusalem. Shortly after, Arius died at Constantinople (A. D. 336).[2] Thus was the Eastern church separated from the Western, the latter adhering to the doctrines of the council of Nice, and espousing the cause of Athanasius. Nor was this situation of affairs changed by the death of Constantine, Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, having gained the same influence over Constantius, the emperor of the East, which he had formerly exerted over Constantine, and being appointed bishop of Constantinople (A. D. 338). From the proceedings of the council at Antioch, however, (A. D. 341,)[3] it is evident that the Eastern church by no means adopted the opinions of Arius; whilst it is equally

---

τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς, καὶ ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα. Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας, ὅτι ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι, ἢ κτιστὸν, τρεπτὸν, ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. Concerning the authorship of this symbolum: *Athanasius* epist. de decretis synodi Nicænæ, and *Eusebii Cæsar.* epist. ad Cæsarienses, most complete as appended to *Athanasii epist. cit.* and in *Theodoreti* h. e. I. 11. Münscher Unterf. über den Sinn der Nicänischen Glaubensformel, in Henkes Neuem Magazin, Bd. 6. S. 334 ff. show that the being of the same essence does not necessarily imply numerical oneness.

1 *Socrates* I. 24. *Sozom.* II. 19. *Theodoret.* I. 21. *Athanasius hist. Arian.* § 4. cf. *Eusebius de vita Const.* III. 59 seq.

2 On the death of Arius, see Walch's Ketzerhist. Th. 2. S. 500–511.

3 The confession of faith of the first council at Antioch (Socr. II. 10) is thus prefaced: Ἡμεῖς οὖτε ἀκόλουθοι Ἀρείου γεγόναμεν (πῶς γὰρ ἐπίσκοποι ὄντες ἀκολουθήσομεν πρεσβυτέρῳ;) οὔτε ἄλλην τινὰ πίστιν παρὰ τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐκτεθεῖσαν ἐδεξάμεθα.

evident from various confessions of faith which were admitted at this synod,[4] that they found no fault with views, which differed but little from those adopted at the council of Nice. So that, on the whole, they seem to have condemned both the Arian doctrine and that opposed to it, preferring a middle course between the two.[5] As this view originated with Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, and was chiefly upheld by him, it may most properly be called the Eusebian,[6] although the Eusebians were commonly reckoned Arians by those who were opposed to them, from their having received Arius into their church-communion. To heal this schism between the Eastern and Western churches, the ground of which was, next to their doctrinal differences, the disgrace of Athanasius, a new council was called at Sardica

---

4 All four of the Antiochian formulæ in Athanasius de synodis § 22 — 25. cf. Walch. bibl. symbol. p. 109 seq. In the *formula Antiochena* I. we read: εἰς ἕνα υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ μονογενῆ, πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ὑπάρχοντα καὶ συνόντα τῷ γεγεννηκότι αὐτὸν πατρί, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, κ. τ. λ. In the *formula Ant.* II: εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, τὸν μονογενῆ Θεὸν, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, τὸν γεννηθέντα πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, ὅλον ἐξ ὅλου, μόνον ἐκ μόνου, τέλειον ἐκ τελείου, βασιλέα ἐκ βασιλέως, κύριον ἐκ κυρίου, λόγον ζῶντα, σοφίαν ζῶσαν, φῶς ἀληθινὸν, ὁδὸν, ἀλήθειαν, ἀνάστασιν, ποιμένα, θύραν, ἄτρεπτόν τε καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον τῆς θεότητος, οὐσίας τε καὶ βουλῆς, καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπαράλλακτον εἰκόνα. τὸν πρωτότοκον πάσης της κτίσεως, τὸν ὄντα ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, Θεὸν λόγον, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ· "καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος." δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα συνέστηκε· τὸν ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν κατελθόντα ἄνωθεν. — εἴ τις παρὰ τὴν ὑγιῆ τῶν γραφῶν ὀρθὴν πίστιν διδάσκει, λέγων, ἢ χρόνον, ἢ καιρὸν, ἢ αἰώνα ἢ εἶναι, ἢ γεγονέναι πρὸ τοῦ γεννηθῆναι τὸν υἱὸν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. καὶ εἴ τις λέγει τὸν υἱὸν κτίσμα ὡς ἓν κτισμάτων, ἢ γέννημα ὡς ἓν τῶν γεννημάτων, ἢ ποίημα ὡς ἓν τῶν ποιημάτων, — ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. In the *formula Ant. III* (Theophronii Episc. Tyanensis): εἰς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, Θεὸν λόγον, δύναμιν καὶ σοφίαν, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων, Θεὸν τέλειον ἐκ Θεοῦ τελείου, καὶ ὄντα πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἐν ὑποστάσει, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν κατελθόντα. — Εἰ δέ τις παρὰ ταύτην τὴν πίστιν διδάσκει, ἢ ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. καὶ Μαρκέλλου τοῦ Ἀγκύρας, ἢ Σαβελλίου, ἢ Παύλου τοῦ Σαμοσατέως, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω καὶ αὐτὸς, καὶ πάντες οἱ κοινωνοῦντες αὐτῷ. In the *formula IV.* (sent to Constans, in Gaul, some time after the Council): εἰς τὸν μονογενῆ αὐτοῦ υἱὸν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, δι' οὗ ἐγένετο τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὁρατὰ καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα, λόγον ὄντα καὶ σοφίαν, καὶ δύναμιν, καὶ ζωὴν, καὶ φῶς ἀληθινόν· — Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων τὸν υἱὸν ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως, καὶ μὴ ἐκ Θεοῦ, καὶ, ἦν ποτε χρόνος ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, ἀλλοτρίους οἴδεν ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. The Arian explanation of the phrase Θεὸν ἐκ Θεου, *Socrat. II.* 45: οὕτως εἴρηται τὸ ἐκ Θεοῦ, ὡς εἴρηται παρὰ τῷ Ἀποστόλῳ· τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ (I Cor. xi. 12). According to Sozomenus III. 5. (where only two Antiochian formulæ are mentioned) the second of these purported to be the symb. Luciani Martyris (§ 63, note 5), and from *Theodoreti* de s. Trinit. dial. III. (*Opp. ed. Schulze, T. V. p.* 991 *seq.*) it seems that this is the still so called *formula Antioch.* II. Athanasius, Hilarius, and Socrates, who give the formulæ, say nothing of this. The anathema at the end is at all events a later addition.

5 So *Cyrillus* Hierosolym. in his Catecheses, about A. D. 348. e. g. *Catech. ad Competentes* XV. § 9: νῦν δέ ἐστιν ἡ ἀποστασία. ἀπίστησαν γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι τῆς ὀρθῆς πίστεως· καὶ οἱ μὲν υἱοπατορίαν καταγγέλλουσιν, οἱ δὲ τὸν χριστὸν ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων εἰς τὸ εἶναι παρενεχθέντα λέγειν τολμῶσι. Καὶ πρότερον μὲν ἦσαν φανεροὶ οἱ αἱρετικοὶ, νῦν δὲ πεπλήρωται ἡ ἐκκλησία κεκρυμμένων αἱρετικῶν. Comp. *Touttée* on this passage and his *Dis.* I. *Cap.* 4, § 17 seq. prefixed to his ed. of Cyril.

6 Thus Athanasius often οἱ περὶ Εὐσέβιον

(A. D. 344)[7] by Constantius and Constans. But this seems only to have brought on more speedily the entire separation of the two churches, the Western church remaining alone at Sardica, whilst the Eastern assembled in the neighbouring town of Philippopolis. Both parties confirmed their former acts, and separated from each other entirely, in the East, under Constantius, Eusebianism being as completely prevalent, as the opposite doctrine in the West, under Constans.

The apprehensions of the Eusebians that the doctrines of their opponents led directly to Sabellianism, were much strengthened by the case of *Marcellus*, bishop of Ancyra. Having contended that the Logos was the eternal wisdom of God, and could be called the Son of God only whilst it dwelt in a human form, which was plainly not far from Sabellianism, and on that account displaced (A. D. 336), he was, nevertheless, taken under the protection of the Western church, and his doctrine declared orthodox.[8] The pupil of Marcellus, *Photinus*, bishop of Sirmium, taught Sabellianism without disguise; and was condemned not only by the Eusebians at the second council of Antioch (A. D. 343),[9] but even by the Western church, at a council held in Milan, in the year 346. At the first council of Sirmium (A. D. 351),[10] he was formally deprived of his

---

7 That it was held A. D. 344, and not A. D. 347. is proved by Mansi de epochis Sardicensis et Sirmiensium conciliorum (in ej. collect. Concill. T. III. p. 87 seq.)

8 Marcellus' chief work was entitled de subjectione domini Christi (Fragm. *Marcelliana ed. et animadvers. instruxit Chr. H. G. Rettberg.* Gott. 1794. 8vo). He was answered by Asterius, Eusebius of Cæsarea, Acacius (Fragm. *Epiphanius* hær. 72. § 5 – 9.), Apollinarius and Basilius of Ancyra. Of these only Eusebii contra Marcellum libb. II. and de ecclesiast. theologia libb. 3, are extant, (both appended to Eusebii Præpar. Evang. Paris. 1628. fol.). — His orthodoxy was acknowledged by Julius, bishop of Rome (epist. ad. Episcop. Eusebianos Antiochiæ congregatos in *Athanasii* Apol. contra Arianos n. 21 – 35), by Athanasius in various passages, and by the synod of Sardica. On the other hand, the later Catholic fathers, Basil the great, Chrysostom, Sulpicius Severus, and others, condemn him. Most moderns, also, Baronius, Petavius, Schelstraaten, etc., consider him a heretic. His most important defender is *Montfaucon* diatr. de causa Marcelli Ancyrani (in ej. Collect. nova Patrum, T. II. p. 51 seq. Paris. 1707. fol., reprinted in *J. Vogt* biblioth. hist. hæresiologicæ, T. I. fasc. II. p. 293 seq. Hamb. 1724. 8vo.

9 In the *formula Antioch.* μακρόστιχος (Athanasius de synodis § 26, and Socrates II. 19, cf. *Walchii* bibl. symb. p. 115): Βδελυσσόμεθα δὲ πρὸς τούτοις καὶ ἀναθεματίζομεν καὶ τοὺς λόγον μὲν μόνον αὐτὸν ψιλὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀνύπαρκτον ἐπιπλάστως καλοῦντας, ἓν ἑτέρῳ τὸ εἶναι ἔχοντα, νῦν μὲν ὡς τὸν προφορικὸν λεγόμενον ὑπό τινων, νῦν δὲ ὡς τὸν ἐνδιάθετον· Χριστὸν δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ μεσίτην καὶ εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ μὴ εἶναι πρὸ αἰώνων θέλοντας, ἀλλ' ἔκ τοτε Χριστὸν αὐτὸν γεγονέναι καὶ υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐξ οὗ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐκ τῆς παρθένου σάρκα ἀνείληφε, πρὸ τετρακοσίων οὐχ ὅλων ἐτῶν. ἔκ τοτε γὰρ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀρχὴν βασιλείας ἐσχηκέναι ἐθέλουσι. καὶ τέλος ἔξειν αὐτὴν μετὰ τὴν συντέλειαν καὶ τὴν κρίσιν. Τοιοῦτοι δέ εἰσιν οἱ ἀπὸ Μαρκέλλου καὶ Φωτεινοῦ (Athan. Σκοτεινοῦ) τῶν Αγκυρογαλατῶν, οἱ τὴν προαιώνιον ὕπαρξιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὴν θεότητα καὶ τὴν ἀτελεύτητον αὐτοῦ βασιλείαν ὁμοίως Ἰουδαίοις ἀθετοῦσιν, ἐπὶ προφάσει τοῦ συνίστασθαι δοκεῖν τῇ μοναρχίᾳ.

10 *Baronius* places the first council at Sirmium in the year 357, *Petavius* more correctly (in annot. ad Epiphan. p. 306 and diss. de Photino hæretico ejusque damnatione, appended to the 3d ed. of Rationar. temp. Par. 1636) in the year 351.

bishoprick by the Eusebians. The sect of the Photinians continued, however, till the reign of Theodosius the younger.

In the mean time Constans died (A. D. 350), and Constantius having become master of the whole Roman empire (after his victory over Magnentius in the year 353), undertook to introduce the doctrine of Eusebius in the West also. At the synods of Arelate (A. D. 353), and Mediolanum (A. D. 355), the bishops were forced to sign the condemnation of Athanasius, all who refused being deposed and exiled. Amongst these were Lucifer, bishop of Calaris, Hilarius, bishop of Pictavium, and Liberius, bishop of Rome.

§ 81.

DISSENSIONS AMONGST THE EUSEBIANS TILL THE SUPPRESSION OF ARIANISM, (A. D. 381).

As soon as the Eusebians became the predominant party, and were no longer held together by the necessity of resisting a common enemy, there began to appear amongst them differences of opinion hitherto unobserved. The party, as a whole, had held a middle course between the Arian opinions and those opposed to them. But now there arose a sect taking its name sometimes from its leaders, Aëtius of Antioch, Eunomius of Cappadocia,[1] and Acacius, bishop of Cæsarea, and sometimes from its opinions (Ἀνόμοιοι, Ἐξουκόντιοι), which adopted the notions of Arius without any variation. Opposed to this was a party under Basilius, bishop of Ancyra, and Georgius, bishop of Laodicea, who insisted particularly upon a distinction, which we find before amongst the Eusebians, that the Son was of *similar* essence with the Father (ὁμοιούσιος), and were hence called Ὁμοιουσιάσται, Ἡμιάρειοι, Semiarians. This schism broke out at the second synod of Sirmium (A. D. 357), when the first named party proved the strongest, and in their decisions rejected every form of the Homoiou-

---

See his controversy on the subject with Sirmond, who defended Baronius. Matth. *Larroquanus* (de la Roque, diss. duplex, I. de Photino hæret. II. de Liberio Pontif. Rom. Genev. 1670. 8vo. P. *de Marca* de tempore syn. Sirm. in his dissertatt. ed. Francof. p. 319. *Pagi* and *Tillemont* have followed Petavius. Mansi, on the other hand, in the treatise before cited (note 7.) puts the council of Sirmium in the 358. — The confession of faith of the first council of Sirmium (*Athanas.* de Syn. § 27), is the *formula Antioch. IV.* to which, however, twenty-seven anathemas are affixed instead of one. Of these, nos. 4 - 22, are directed against Photinus. VI: εἴ τις τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ θεοῦ πλατύνεσθαι ἢ συστέλλεσθαι φάσκοι, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. VII: εἴ τις πλατυνομένην τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν υἱὸν λέγοι ποιεῖν, ἢ τὸν πλατυσμὸν τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ υἱὸν ὀνομάζοι, ἀν. ἔ. VIII: εἴ τις ἰδιάθετον ἢ προφορικὸν λόγον λέγοι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀ. ἔ.

1 Concerning him vid. *Basnage* in Canisii Lectiones antt. vol. I. p. 172 seq. Ullmann's Gregorius v. Nazianz, S. 318 ff. — His ἔκθεσις τῆς πίστεως prim. ed. *H. Valesius* in notis ad *Socrat.* V. 10, then also by *Basnage* l. c. His Ἀπολογητικὸς prim. ed. *Fabricius* in *Bibl. græca, vol. VIII.* p. 262, reprinted, though without Fabricius' notes, in *Basilii M. Opp. ed. Garnier*, T. I. p. 618 seq.

sian doctrine.[2] Thereupon a synod was assembled at Ancyra by Basilius, bishop of Ancyra, (A. D. 358), at which the Semiarian doctrine was confirmed, and the Arian rejected.[3] This party was soon joined by the emperor Constantius, and a third synod of Sirmium (A. D. 358) rejected the confession of faith adopted at the second, and confirmed the anathemas of the synod of Ancyra.[4] From this time, the strife between Arians and Semiarians was incessant. In vain did Constantine assemble councils (the most remarkable were the two held simultaneously by the Western church at Ariminum and the

---

2 *Formula Sirmiensis II.*, (in the Latin original *Hilarius* de synodis § 11. translated into Greek *Athanas.* de synod. § 28. Walch. bibl. symb. p. 133 seq.): — Unum constat Deum esse omnipotentem et patrem, sicut per universum orbem creditur, et unicum filium ejus Jesum Christum, dominum salvatorem nostrum, ex ipso ante sæcula genitum. — Quod vero quosdam aut multos movebat de substantia, quæ græce *usia* adpellatur, id est, ut expressius intelligatur, *homousion*, aut quod dicitur *homœusion*, nullam omnino fieri oportere mentionem, nec quemquam prædicare: ea de causa et ratione, quod nec in divinis scripturis continearur, et quod super hominis scientiam sit, nec quisquam possit nativitatem filii enarrare, de quo scriptum est: *generationem ejus quis enarrabit?* Scire autem manifestum est solum patrem, quomodo genuerit filium suum, et filium, quomodo genitus sit a patre. Nulla ambiguitas est, majorem esse patrem. Nulli potest dubium esse, patrem honore, dignitate, claritate, majestate et ipso nomine patris majorem esse filio, ipso testante: *qui me misit, major me est.* Et hoc catholicum esse, nemo ignorat, duas personas esse patris et filii, majorem patrem: filium subjectum cum omnibus his, quæ ipsi pater subjecit. Patrem initium non habere, invisibilem esse, immortalem esse, impassibilem esse. Filium autem natum esse ex patre, deum ex deo, lumen ex lumine. Cujus filii generationem, ut ante dictum est, neminem scire, nisi patrem suum, cæt.

3 The decrees of this synod, Epiphan. hær. 73, § 2 — 11. e. g. § 9: *ὡς ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας, οὐκ ἐπὶ τὴν ταυτότητα ἤγετο τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς οὐσίας ὁμοιότητα· οὕτως οὐδὲ ὁ υἱὸς ὅμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν γενόμενος τῷ γεννήσαντι πατρὶ, εἰς ταυτότητα ἄξει τοῦ πατρὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ οὐσίαν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν ὁμοιότητα.* § 10: *Καὶ εἴ τις—μὴ—τὴν ὁμοιότητα καὶ κατ' οὐσίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ πρὸς πατέρα ὁμολογοίη, ὡς ψευδωνύμως λέγων τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν, καὶ μήτε πατέρα λέγων ἀληθῶς μήτε υἱόν, ἀλλὰ κτιστὴν καὶ κτίσμα — ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.* — § 11: *Καὶ εἴ τις τὸ ἔκτισέ με, καὶ τὸ γεννᾷ με παρ' αὐτοῦ ἀκούων, τὸ γεννᾷ με μὴ ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ κατ' οὐσίαν ἐννοεῖ, ἀλλὰ ταὐτὸν λέγει τὸ γεννᾷ με τῷ ἔκτισέ με, ὡς μὴ λέγων τὸν υἱὸν τὸν ἀπαθῶς τέλειον ἐκ τῶν δύο ὀνομάτων, τοῦ ἔκτισέ με καὶ τοῦ γεννᾷ με, κτίσμα μόνον ὁμολογῶν καὶ μηκέτι υἱὸν, ὡς παραδίδωκεν ἡ σοφία ἐκ τῶν δύο εὐσεβῶς τὴν ἔννοιαν, ἀ. ἔ.* Καὶ εἴ τις τοῦ υἱοῦ τὴν μὲν κατ' οὐσίαν πρὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ πατέρα ὁμοιότητα ἡμῖν ἀποκαλύπτοντος, δι' ὧν φησι· ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ζωὴν ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ, οὕτως καὶ τῷ υἱῷ ἔδωκε ζωὴν ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ* (John v. 26)· *τὴν δὲ κατ' ἐνέργειαν, δι' ὧν παιδεύει· ἃ γὰρ ἂν ὁ πατὴρ ποιῇ, ταῦτα καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁμοίως ποιεῖ* (John v. 19), *μόνην τὴν κατ' ἐνέργειαν ὁμοιότητα διδούσης* (leg. *διδοὺς, τῆς*) *κατ' οὐσίαν, ἥ ἐστι τὸ κεφαλαιωδέστατον ἡμῶν τῆς πίστεως, ἀποστεροῖη τοῦ υἱοῦ — ἀ. ἔ.* — *Εἴ τις — ἀνόμοιον λέγοι κατ' οὐσίαν τὸν υἱὸν τῷ πατρὶ, ἀ. ἔ.* — *Εἴ τις τὸν πατέρα πρεσβύτερον χρόνῳ λέγοι τοῦ ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ, νεώτερον δὲ χρόνῳ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ πατρὸς, ἀ. ἔ.* At last however: *Εἴ τις ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ οὐσίᾳ λέγων τὸν πατέρα πατέρα τοῦ υἱοῦ, ὁμοούσιον ἢ ταυτοούσιον λέγοι τὸν υἱὸν τῷ πατρὶ, ἀ. ἔ.*

4 Concerning Liberius, bishop of Rome, who in the year 358, subscribed two Eusebian formulas for the sake of regaining his episcopal dignity, see *Larroquani* diss. cited note 10, p. 198, and *Jo. la Placette* observationes hist. eccles., quibus eruitur veteris ecclesiæ sensus circa Pont Rom. potestatem in definiendis fidei rebus. Amstel. 1695. p. 137 – 150.

Eastern at Seleucia, A. D. 359), and resort to force; — nothing was effected, and at last he left all in the greatest confusion.[5]

With his death, the interference of the emperors in the affairs of the church was, for a time, suspended. Julian (A. D. 361–363), was, of course, alike indifferent to every Christian sect, and restored all the banished bishops to their sees.[6] Jovian, also, (+ 364,) and his successors in the West, Valentinian I. (+ A. D. 375), Gratian, and Valentinian II. were in the highest degree tolerant. On the other hand, Valens, emperor of the East, (A. D. 364–378,) was a zealous Arian, and persecuted the opposite party with great bitterness. Various causes had contributed, since the death of Constantius, to increase the numbers of those who adopted the decrees of the council of Nice, even in the East. Though before the internal divisions among the Eusebians, the most different opinions had been allowed amongst them, they, for the most part, still held fast the old Platonic view of the origin of the Son. (vid. § 51. p. 101.) When, therefore, the attempt was now made to introduce pure Arianism as the universal faith, the majority of the Oriental church were extremely dissatisfied; whilst, on the other hand, the decrees of the council of Nice seemed to be hardly more than a fuller developement of their own notions.[7]

---

5 His character is well drawn by *Ammian. Marcellin.* XXI. 16: Christianam religionem absolutam et simplicem anili superstitione confundens; in qua scrutanda perplexius, quam componenda gravius, excitavit discidia plurima, quæ progressa fusius alunt concertatione verborum: ut catervis Antistitum jumentis publicis ultro citroque discurrentibus per Synodos, quas appellant, dum ritum omnem ad suum trahere conantur arbitrium, rei vehiculariæ succiderent nervos.

6 *Ammian. Marc.* XXII. 5: Utque dispositorum roboraret effectum, dissidentes Christianorum Antistites cum plebe discissa in palatium intromissos monebat, ut civilibus discordiis consopitis quisque nullo vetante religioni suæ serviret intrepidus. Quod agebat ideo obstinate, ut dissensiones augente licentia, non timeret unanimantem postea plebem; nullas infestas hominibus bestias, ut sunt sibi ferales plerique Christianorum, expertus. Sæpeque dictitabat: *Audite me, quem Alemanni audierunt et Franci.*

7 Hence, even the Semiarians thought, that, by subscribing to the decrees of the council of Nice, they did not change their faith, but only expressed it more definitely. Thus, Basil the Great had once belonged to the Semiarian party, and had taken an active part in the disputations carried on at Constantinople by the heads of that party, Basilius of Ancyra, and Eustathius of Sebaste, A. D. 359 (Greg. Nyss. contra Eunom. I. p. 301. Philostorg. IV. c. 12): still he says of himself: ἴ γε τοῦτο τολμῶ καυχᾶσθαι ἐν κυρίῳ, ὅτι οὐδέ ποτε πεπλανημένας ἔσχον τὰς περὶ θεοῦ ὑπολήψεις, ἢ ἑτέρως φρονῶν μετέμαθον ὕστερον. — Ὥσπερ γὰρ τὸ σπέρμα αὐξανόμενον μεῖζον μὲν ἀπὸ μικροῦ γίνεται, ταὐτὸν δέ ἐστιν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, οὐ κατὰ γένος μεταβαλλόμενον, ἀλλὰ κατ' αὔξησιν τελειούμενον· οὕτω λογίζομαι καὶ ἐμοὶ τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον διὰ τῆς προκοπῆς πεῦξῆσθαι· οὐχὶ δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὄντος τὸν νῦν ὑπάρχοντα γεγενῆσθαι. — The bishop Dianius, one of the predecessors of Basil, in Cæsarea, had played a conspicuous part under the Eusebian bishops at the councils of Antioch and Philippopolis, and yet Basil, Ep. 51. (al. 80,) praises him in high terms, and says, Ep. 140: ἔστι τοίνυν ἐκ πατέρων ἐμπολιτευομένη τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἡμῶν ἡ γραφεῖσα παρὰ τῶν ἀγίων πατέρων πίστις τῶν κατὰ τὴν Νίκαιαν συνελθόντων. So, also, speaking of the Semiarians, *Athanasius de Synodis* § 41: πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἀποδεχομένους τὰ μὲν ἄλλα πάντα πάντα τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ γραφέντων, περὶ δὲ μόνου τὸ Ὁμοούσιον ἀμφιβάλλοντας, χρὴ μὴ ὡς πρὸς ἐχθροὺς διακεῖσθαι· καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἡμεῖς οὐχ ὡς πρὸς Ἀρειομανίτας, οὐδ' ὡς μαχομένους πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἐνεστήμεθα, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀδελφοὶ πρὸς ἀδελφοὺς διαλεγόμεθα, τὴν αὐτὴν μὲν ἡμῖν διάνοιαν ἔχοντας, περὶ δὲ τὸ ὄνομα μόνον διεστάζοντας. So *Hilarius de Synodis*, § 76 seq.

At the same time, the division and uncertainty of the Eusebians could not but contrast very unfavorably with the unanimity of their opponents. To all this was added the influence of Monachism, which, originating in Egypt, and already attracting universal admiration, had allied itself closely with Athanasius, and, wherever it came, was busy in advancing his cause.[8]

Amongst these new adherents to the decrees of the council at Nice, were Meletius, who declared himself in their favor immediately upon becoming bishop of Antioch, in the year 361;[9] and, in Asia Minor, three distinguished men, Basil, the great, Gregory of Nazianzum, and Gregory of Nyssa, who were equally diligent in the cause of Monachism and Homoousianism.

Still, the Meletian schism at Antioch[10] prevented a perfect union between the old and the new adherents of the council of Nice. In this city there had always remained a small number of the followers of Eustathius (see § 80), led on by a certain presbyter, Paulinus, and claiming to hold the doctrines of the council of Nice in greater purity than Meletius. They refused to acknowledge him as their bishop, and accused him of false doctrine, in teaching that there were three essences in the Trinity. The council assembled by Athanasius at Alexandria (A. D. 362), amongst other attempts to smooth the way for the Arians to join their party, sought to appease this dispute at Antioch by such concessions as might unite the two parties;[11] but all their designs were defeated by the consecration of Paulinus as bishop

---

8 Hence the frequent persecutions of the monks in Egypt by the Arians. cf. *Athanasii Encyclica*, c. 3. *Hist. Arianorum*, c. 70, 72, et passim. So, too, under Valens. *Socrat.* IV. 22 and 24. Thus the monks in Cappadocia broke off all communion with Gregory of Nazianzum, father of the theologian, A. D. 363, because he had subscribed a doubtful formula. vid. Ullmann's Gregor. v. Nazianz, S. 61. *Gregor. Naz.* (*orat.* XXI. p. 388,) says of the monks, in reference to this: οἳ κἂν τἆλλα ὦσιν εἰρηνικοί τε καὶ μέτριοι, τοῦτό γε οὐ φέρουσιν ἐπιεικεῖς εἶναι, θεὸν προδιδόναι διὰ τῆς ἡσυχίας. ἀλλὰ καὶ λίαν εἰσὶν ἐνταῦθα πολεμικοί τε καὶ δύσμαχοι, — καὶ θᾶττον ἄν τι μὴ δίον παρακινήσαιεν, ἢ δίον παραλίποιεν.

9 *Epiphan. hær.* LXXIII. c. 28, 34. *Socrat.* II. 44. *Sozom.* IV. 26. *Theodoret.* II. 27.

10 Thereon vid. Walch's Ketzerhistorie, Th. 4. S. 410 ff.

11 *Epistola Synodica Conc. Alex. (Mansi* III. *p.* 345 *seq.)*: Πάντας τοίνυν τοὺς βουλομένους εἰρηνεύειν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, μάλισστα τοὺς ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ συναγομένους (the Meletians) καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀρειανῶν προσκαλέσασθε παρ' ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ ὡς μὲν πατέρες υἱοὺς προσλάβεσθε, ὡς δὲ διδάσκαλοι καὶ κηδεμόνες ἀποδείξασθε, καὶ συνάψαντες ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς ἀγαπητοῖς ἡμῶν τοῖς περὶ Παυλῖνον, μηδὲν πλεῖον ἀπαιτήσητε παρ' αὐτῶν, ἢ ἀναθεματίζειν μὲν τὴν Ἀρειανὴν αἵρεσιν, ὁμολογεῖν δὲ τὴν παρ' αὐτῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ὁμολογηθεῖσαν ἐν Νικαίᾳ πίστιν. Then an account of the dispute concerning the Hypostase. The one party believe in three essences: διὰ τὸ εἰς ἁγίαν τριάδα πιστεύειν οὐκ ὀνόματι τριάδα μόνον, ἀλλ' ἀληθῶς οὖσαν καὶ ὑφεστῶσαν, πατέρα τε ἀληθῶς ὄντα καὶ ὑφεστῶτα, καὶ υἱὸν ἀληθῶς ἐνούσιον ὄντα καὶ ὑφεστῶτα καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ὑφεστὸς καὶ ὑπάρχον. The other in one: ἡγούμενοι ταὐτὸν εἶναι εἰπεῖν ὑπόστασιν καὶ οὐσίαν. The two parties had mutually acknowledged each other's orthodoxy, and had agreed, βελτίονα καὶ ἀκριβεστέραν εἶναι τὴν ἐν Νικαίᾳ παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ὁμολογηθεῖσαν πίστιν, καὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ τοῖς ταύτης ἀρκεῖσθαι μᾶλλον καὶ χρῆσθαι ῥήμασιν.

of the Eustathians. This was done by Lucifer, bishop of Calaris; and, although this man soon afterwards separated from the church,[12] in discontent at the mildness of the council of Alexandria, the step he had taken in consecrating Paulinus proved a serious obstacle to the union of the old and new Nicenians. Those in the East and in Egypt looked on Paulinus as the true bishop of Antioch, whilst those in the West upheld the cause of Meletius. These last held the more tenaciously to the doctrine of three essences in the Trinity, that the expressions of their opponents seemed to savour so strongly of Sabellianism.[13] If Valens had now (from the year 361 – 378) favored the Semiarians, instead of the Arians, he might, perhaps, have considerably checked the spread of the Nicenian doctrines; but, by attempting to give the ascendancy to Arianism, and the pitiless persecution of all who differed from its doctrines,[14] he drove the remnant of the Semiarians to join the Nicenians. Thus the Semiarians, (or, as they were now called in Constantinople, the Macedonians, from Macedonius, a bishop of that city, who had been displaced (A. D. 360) by the influence of the Arians,)[15] were much diminished in number, whilst the numbers of the Nicenians were proportionally increased.[16] Notwithstanding

---

12 On this subject see Walch's Ketzerhist. Th. 3. S. 338 ff. *E. A. Frommani* de Lucifero Calaritano olim præsule Epistola. Coburgi. 1767. 4to.

13 Basil declares it to be of the greatest importance to believe in *τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις*, since Sabellius also taught the doctrine of *μίαν ὑπόστασιν* and *τρία πρόσωπα*. Comp. especially *Basilii Epist.* 38 (al. 43), also *Ep* 125 (al. 78), 210 (al. 64), 214 (al. 349). Hence his joy, *Epist.* 258 *(al.* 325) *ad Epiphanium*, at the declaration of Epiphanius, *τὸ τρεῖς ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι τὰς ὑποστάσεις ὁμολογεῖν. Epist.* 263 *(al.* 74) *ad Occidentales*, he accuses Paulinus of an inclination *πρὸς τὸ Μαρκέλλου δόγμα, οὔτε υἱὸν ἐν ἰδίᾳ ὑποστάσει ὁμολογοῦν, ἀλλὰ προσεκχθέντα, καὶ πάλιν ὑποστρέψαντα εἰς τὸν ἔνθεν προσῆλθεν.* Comp. Münscher's Dogmengesch. Bd. 3. S. 491 ff. Ullmann's Gregorius v. Naz. S. 356 ff. The Latins had only one expression for *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις*, namely, *substantia*, and used the word *persona* to designate the essences, which was altogether unsatisfactory to the Orientals. How suspicious this term seemed to these last, vid. *Basilii Ep.* 69 *(al.* 52) *ad Athanasium*, A. D. 371: *Ἐπιζητεῖται δὲ κἀκεῖνο παρὰ τινῶν τῶν ἐντεῦθεν ἀναγκαίως, ὡς καὶ αὐτοῖς ἡμῖν καταφαίνεται, τὸ τὴν Μαρκέλλου αἵρεσιν αὐτοὺς* (Occidentales) — *ἐξορίσαι. ἐπεὶ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν ἐν πᾶσιν οἷς ἐπιστέλλουσι γράμμασι τὸν μὲν δυσώνυμον Ἄρειον ἄνω καὶ κάτω ἀναθεματίζοντες — οὐ διαλείπουσι· Μαρκέλλῳ δὲ, τῷ κατὰ διαμετρὲν ἐκείνῳ τὴν ἀσέβειαν ἐπιδειξαμένῳ, καὶ εἰς αὐτὴν τὴν ὕπαρξιν τῆς τοῦ μονογενοῦς θεότητος ἀσεβήσαντι, — οὐδεμίαν μέμψιν ἐπενεγκόντες φαίνονται. — τοῦτον οὐδαμοῦ διαβαλόντες ἐφάνησαν, καὶ ταῦτα αἰτίαν ἔχοντες, ὡς τὸ ἐξ ἀρχῆς κατ' ἄγνοιαν τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ εἰς κοινωνίαν αὐτὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παραδεξάμενοι. Ἐκείνου τε οὖν μνησθῆναι πρειπόντως ἀπαιτεῖ τὰ παρόντα, κ. τ. λ.*

14 *Themistii λόγος προσφωνητικὸς*, delivered in Antioch about A. D. 372, before the emperor, is said to have made him somewhat more mild. *Socrat.* IV. 32, *Sozom.* VI. 36, not to be confounded with the Orat. de relig. (§ 75. 3.) Neand. II. 1. 149.

15 *Socrat.* II. 45.

16 As early as A. D. 366, an embassy of the Semiarians of Asia Minor to Rome to subscribe the Nicæan Confession, *Socrat.* IV. 12: *φόβῳ μᾶλλον καὶ βίᾳ στενοχωρούμενοι, — δηλοῦντες δεῖν ἐξ ἀνάγκης καταφεύγειν περί τε τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ βασιλέως* (Valentinian I.) *καὶ ἐπὶ Λιβέριον τῆς Ῥώμης Ἐπίσκοπον, ἀσπάζεσθαί τε τῶν ἐκείνων πίστιν μᾶλλον ἢ κοινωνεῖν τοῖς περὶ Εὐδόξιον. cf. Sozom.* VI. 10.

the effort of Basil, however, the church-communion was not yet established between the Nicenians of the Eastern and Western empire.[17] In the mean time, new schisms had occurred on other points of dispute. Hitherto, nothing had been said concerning the Holy Spirit, and on this point the most various opinions were entertained.[18] But, when not only the Semiarians, but even many of the new Nicenians in the East, continued to hold, with the Arians, that the Holy Spirit was created by the Father, as his minister, the other Nicenians were displeased at the doctrine, and attacked those who professed it as *Πνευματομάχους*.[19] And, lastly, one more was added to these endless

---

17 Comp. *Basilii* Ep. 69 ad Athanasium, Ep. 70 ad Damasum, both A. D. 371 (see *Garnier vita Basilii*, *p.* 94, prefixed to Tom. III. Opp. Bas.). Then, A. D. 372: Ep. 90 ad Occidentales, Ep. 91 ad Valerianum, Illyric. Episc., Ep. 92 ad Italos et Gallos (*Garnier*, *p.* 110), — A. D. 376: Ep 242 Orientalium ad Occidentales, Ep. 243 Basilii ad Episc. Italos et Gallos (*Garnier*, *p.* 159). — A. D. 377: Ep. 263 Orientalium ad Occidentales (*Garnier*, *p.* 165) — Concerning these negotiations with the *Δυτικοῖς Basilius* says, (*Ep.* 239 (al. 10) *ad Euseb. Episc. Samosatorum*, A. D. 376): ἐμοὶ μὲν γὰρ τὸ τοῦ Διομήδους (Iliad. I. 695, 696.) ἐπέρχεται λέγειν· μὴ ὄφελες λίσσεσθαι· διότι, φησίν, ἀγήνωρ ἐστίν ὁ ἀνήρ. Τῷ ὄντι γὰρ θεραπεύομενα τὰ ὑπερήφανα ἤδη ἑαυτῶν ὑπεροπτικώτερα γίνεσθαι πέφυκε. Καὶ γὰρ ἐὰν μὲν ἱλασθῇ ἡμῖν ὁ κύριος, ποίας ἑτέρας προσδήκης δεόμεθα; ἐὰν δὲ ἐπιμείνῃ ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ, ποία βοήθεια ἡμῖν τῆς δυτικῆς ὀρρύος; οἱ τὸ ἀληθὲς οὔτε ἴσασιν οὔτε μαθεῖν ἀνέχονται, ψευδέσι δὲ ὑπονοίαις προειλημμένοι, ἐκεῖνα ποιοῦσι νῦν, ἃ πρότερον ἐπὶ Μακεέλλῳ· πρὸς μὲν τοὺς τὴν ἀλήθειαν αὐτοῖς ἀπαγγέλλοντας φιλονεικήσαντες, τὴν δὲ αἵρεσιν δι' ἑαυτῶν βεβαιώσαντες. Ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ αὐτός, ἄνευ τοῦ κοινοῦ σχήματος, ἐβουλόμην αὐτῶν ἐπισυστῆναι τῷ κορυφαίῳ, περὶ μὲν τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν οὐδὲν, εἰ μὴ ὅσον παραινέσασθαι, ὅτι οὔτε ἴσασι τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, οὔτε τὴν ὁδὸν, δι' ἧς ἂν μανθάνοιεν, καταδέχονται.

18 *Gregorii Naz. Orat.* 37, *de Spir. S.* p. 595: Τῶν δὲ καθ' ἡμᾶς σοφῶν οἱ μὲν ἐνέργειαν τοῦτο (τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον) ὑπέλαβον, οἱ δὲ κτίσμα, οἱ δὲ θεὸν, οἱ δὲ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ὁπότερον τούτων, αἰδοῖ τῆς γραφῆς, ὥς φασιν, ὡς οὐδὲν ἕτερον σαφῶς δηλωσάσης. — οἱ μὲν ἄχρι διανοίας εἰσὶν εὐσεβεῖς, οἱ δὲ τολμῶσιν εὐσεβεῖν καὶ τοῖς χείλεσιν, κ. τ. λ. Münscners Dogmengesch. Bd. 3, S. 452 ff. Basil, the great, also, avoided calling the Holy Ghost *God*, for which Gregory of Nazianzum thus excuses him (*Gregor. Ep.* 26 *ad Basil.*): πολὺς περὶ αὐτὸν ὁ πόλεμος, ζητούντων λαβίσθαι τῶν αἱρετικῶν γυμνῆς τῆς φωνῆς (namely, περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος, ὡς εἴη θεὸς) — ἵν' ὁ μὲν ἴζωσθῇ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, μίζωθῇ δὲ τὸ κακὸν ἐν τῇ πόλει. So also in his panegyric on Basil, *Orat. XX. p.* 364. The monks of Cæsarea were especially excited against Basil, to whom *Athanasius* (*Ep. ad Palladium.*) says in extenuation of Basil's conduct: αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ, ὡς πεπάρρηκα, τοῖς ἀσθενοῦσιν ἀσθενὴς γίνεται, ἵνα τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς κερδήσῃ· cf. *Garnier*, *vita Basilii*, *p.* 95 *seq.*

19 They were first attacked by *Athanasius*, *Epist. IV. ad Serapionem Episc. Thmuitanum* (between A. D. 358 and 360). Serapion having informed him (Epist. I. init.), ὡς ἐξελθόντων μέν τινων ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀρειανῶν διὰ τὴν κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ βλασφημίαν, φρονούντων δὲ κατὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος καὶ λεγόντων αὐτὸ μὴ μόνον κτίσμα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν λειτουργικῶν πνευμάτων ἓν αὐτὸ εἶναι, καὶ βαθμῷ μόνον αὐτὸ διαφέρειν τῶν ἀγγέλων. *Epist. Synod. Conc. Alex.* A. D. 362. — *Basilii M. de Spiritu S. lib. ad Amphilochium*, A. D. 374. — *Gregorii Nazianz.* Orat. 37 and 44. (Comp. Ullmann's Gregorius v. Naz. S. 378 ff.) *Epiphanius adv. hær.* (about A. D. 374) *hær.* LXXIII. τῶν Ἡμιαρείων. § 1: οἱ δὲ αὐτοὶ καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἴσως τοῖς Πνευματομάχοις εἰσὶν ἔχοντες. *Hær.* LXXIV. τῶν Πνευματομάχων. § 1: Ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν Ἡμιαρείων, καὶ ἀπὸ ὀρθοδόξων τινὲς, ὡς εἰπεῖν, τέρας τισὶ [*leg.* τεράστιοι] γεννηθέντες ἄνθρωποι — βλασφημοῦσι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. In the year 377, the Orientals complained to the Western church of Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste, who had been at the head of the Semiarian embassy to Rome, (see note 16,) and since then had held to the confession of the council of Nice (*Basilii Ep.* 263, § 3):

sects by Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea, and a zealous advocate of the decrees of the council of Nice, who taught (from about the year 371), that in Christ the divine nature supplied the place of the soul (*νοῦς* or *ψυχὴ λογική*).[20]

Thus, at the accession of Theodosius (A. D. 379), we find in the West universal toleration; and in the East, Arianism prevalent, the opposite doctrines persecuted; and, besides these two parties, the Photinians, the Macedonians, and the Apollinarists, together with innumerable other older sects. Theodosius, who was a zealous adherent of the decrees of the council of Nice, at once declared the doctrines

---

τοῖς ἀναθεματίζουσι τὸ ὁμοούσιον σύνισσι, καὶ πρωτοστάτης ἐστὶ τῆς τῶν πνευματομάχων αἱρέσεως. Philastrius (about 380) *de hæresibus* c. 67: Semiariani sunt quoque. Hi de Patre et Filio bene sentiunt, — Spiritum autem non de divina substantia, nec Deum verum, sed factum atque creatum Spiritum prædicantes, ut eum conjungant et comparent creaturæ. In all these writers, those, who were heretical in their views concerning the Holy Ghost, are uniformly called *Pneumatomachi*. The name *Macedoniani* was, at that time, exclusively applied to the Semiarians about Constantinople. But at the time of the first council of Constantinople (A. D. 381), that city was the chief seat of the Semiarians (cf. Gregorii Naz. vita a Gregor. Presbyt. conscripta). Hence the names *Macedonians*, *Semiarians*, and, as all Semiarians held the obnoxious doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit, *Pneumatomachi* were used indiscriminately at that council. Now, as the difference of doctrine with respect to the Son was considered of little importance, the real distinction of the party was this doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit. Hence, by an easy transition, Macedonius came to be considered the author of this heresy; as is the case so early as Sozom. IV. 27: *ἐπειδὴ Μακεδόνιος ἀφῃρέθη τὴν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐκκλησίαν, εἰσηγεῖτο τὸν υἱὸν θεὸν εἶναι, κατὰ πάντα τε καὶ κατ' οὐσίαν ὅμοιον τῷ πατρί· τὸ δὲ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἄμοιρον τῶν αὐτῶν προσβείων ἀπεφαίνετο, διάκονον καὶ ὑπηρέτην καλῶν, καὶ ὅσα περὶ τῶν θείων ἀγγέλων λέγων τὶς οὐκ ἂν ἁμάρτοι.* Thus from this time, the usual name for those who were heretical in their views of the Holy Ghost was *Macedoniani*, instead of *Pneumatomachi*: although it is certain that Macedonius, though like other Semiarians a convert to that heresy, was not its author.

20 *Epist. Synod. Conc. Alex.* (A. D. 362, *παρῆσαν δὲ καί τινες Ἀπολιναρίου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μονάζοντες, παρ' αὐτοῦ εἰς τοῦτο πεμφθέντες*): *ὁμολόγουν γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο, ὅτι οὐ σῶμα ἄψυχον, οὐδ' ἀναίσθητον, οὐδ' ἀνόητον εἶχεν ὁ σωτήρ.* This notion also is contradicted by *Athanasius*, especially in Epist. ad Epictetum (A. D. 371), Contra Apollinarium libb. II. (A. D. 372), though without naming Apollinaris. Epiphanius, however, (hær. 77,) considers these works as answers to him. Basil the Great heard of the heresy of Apollinaris, A. D. 373, (Ep. 129 ad Meletium,) and wrote, 374, concerning it, Ep. 264 ad Occidentales, and Ep. 265 ad Ægyptios. Fragments from the writings of Apollinaris (*περὶ ἐνσαρκώσεως, περὶ πίστεως*) are preserved in Gregory of Nyssa, and Theodoretus. Fragments from his letters in *Leontius Byzant.* (about A. D. 590) adv. fraudes Apollinaristarum libb. 2. (ex lat. vers. Turriani in Canisii lectt. ant. ed. Basnage, T. I. p. 608 seq. Gallandii Bibl. PP. T. XII. p. 706). Answers to Apollinaris were written by *Diodorus Tarsensis*, *Theodotus Antiochenus*, and two bishops of Alexandria, *Theophilus* and *Cyril*. Still extant are *Gregorii Naz.* Ep. ad Nectarium, or Orat. 46, and Epp. II. ad Cledonium, or Orat. 51 and 52 (Ullmanns Greg. v. Naz. S. 401 ff.): and, far more valuable, *Gregorii Nysseni ἀντιῤῥητικὸς πρὸς τὰ Ἀπολιναρίου* (prim. ed. *L. Zacagnius* collectan. Monim. veter. eccl. *Gr.-Gallandii* Bibl. pp. T. VI. p. 517), our chief authority. — *Apollinarius* ap. Greg. Nyss. c. 35: *ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἴς ἐστιν ἐκ πνεύματος καὶ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος.* — c. 9: *τὸ δὴ πνεῦμα, τουτέστι τὸν νοῦν, θεὸν ἔχων ὁ Χριστὸς μετὰ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος, εἰκότως ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ λέγεται* (1 Cor. xv. 47 seq.). — c. 7: *θεὸς μέν (ἐστι) τῷ πνεύματι τῷ σαρκωθέντι, ἄνθρωπος δὲ τῇ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ προσληφθείσῃ σαρκί.* — c. 23: *οὐκ ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ὡς*

there sanctioned to be the only true faith, and persecuted every other.[21] The more effectually to remedy the existing evils, he summoned a general council at Constantinople (A. D. 381),[22] at which the symbolum (or confession of faith) of the council of Nice was confirmed, and the heresies of later date provided for by new articles.[23] In the West, the Arians were left unmolested for some years longer, under Valen-

---

ἄνθρωπος (Phil. ii. 7). διότι οὐχ ὁμοούσιος τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ κατὰ τὸ κυριώτατον. — c. 39: εἰ ἀνθρώπῳ τελείῳ συνήφθη θεὸς τέλειος, δύο ἂν ἦσαν, (c. 42:) εἷς μὲν φύσει υἱὸς θεοῦ, εἷς δὲ θεός. — c 48: εἰ ἐκ πάντων τῶν ἴσων ἡμῖν ἐστι τοῖς χοϊκοῖς ὁ ἐπουράνιος ἄνθρωπος (ὥστε καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἔσον ἔχειν τοῖς χοϊκοῖς), οὐκ ἐπουράνιος θεοῦ δοχεῖον. — c. 44: Ἡ σὰρξ τοῦ Κυρίου προσκυνεῖται, καθὸ ἓν ἐστι πρόσωπον καὶ ἓν ζῶον μετ' αὐτοῦ. Μηδὲν ποίημα προσκυνητὸν μετὰ τοῦ Κυρίου, ὡς ἡ σὰρξ αὐτοῦ. According to some, Apollinaris taught also the doctrine of the Millenium, Epiph. hær. 77, § 26. Names *Apollinaristæ*, Συνουσιασταί, Διμοιρισταί (in Epiph.). Some of his followers, especially *Polemius* (Polemiani) taught ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν κατελήλυθέναι τοῦ Κυρίου τὸ σῶμα, ὁμοούσιον τὸ σῶμα τ. Χρ. τῇ θεότητι. Epiph. hær. 77, § 2, 20. Theodoret. hær. fab. IV. 9. *Chr. A. Salig.* de Euthychianismo ante Eutychen. Guelpherb. 1723–4. From this time forward, the Platonic notions concerning three substances in man began to be considered heresy. *Keilii* opusc. acad. T. II. p. 641 seq.

21 A. D. 380, Cod. Theod. XVI. 1, 2. Cunctos populos, quos Clementiæ nostræ regit temperamentum, in tali volumus religione versari, quam divinum Petrum Apostolum tradidisse Romanis religio usque nunc ab ipso insinuata declarat, quamque pontificem Damasum sequi claret, et Petrum, Alexandriæ episcopum, virum apostolicæ sanctitatis: hoc est ut secundum apostolicam disciplinam evangelicamque doctrinam patris et filii et spiritus sancti unam deitatem sub parili majestate et sub pia trinitate credamus. *Hanc legem sequentes Christianorum catholicorum nomen jubemus amplecti*, reliquos vero dementes vesanosque judicantes, hæretici dogmatis infamiam sustinere, nec conciliabula eorum ecclesiarum nomen accipere, divina primum vindicta, post etiam motus nostri, quem ex cœlesti arbitrio sumseримus, ultione plectendos. Ullmanns Gregor v. Naz. S. 220 ff.

22 Concerning which see Ullmanns Gregor v. Naz. S. 238 ff. It is remarkable that Meletius was summoned to this council as bishop of Antioch, instead of Paulinus, and was even made a πρόεδρος of the council (Greg. Naz. carmen de vita sua. v. 1514). Meletius dying during his attendance at the council, Flavianus was appointed to succeed him, without reference to Paulinus. Ullmann, S. 245). The schism did not entirely disappear till the year 413 (Theodoret. V. 35).

23 *Symb. Niceno-Constantinopolitanum*: Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν, πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων. καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο. Τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα· σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ παθόντα καὶ ταφέντα καὶ ἀναστάντα ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς· καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τὸ κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιὸν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν· εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Ὁμολογοῦμεν ἓν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν· προσδοκῶμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. Αμήν. *J. C. Suicer* Symbolum

tinian,[24] but at length he was persuaded by Theodosius to take part against them,[25] and the sect was now everywhere suppressed. The last traces of its existence in the Roman empire are found in a law of Theodosius II., in the year 428.

We have seen (p. 200), that many of those, who joined the Nicenians in the East, did not look upon themselves as giving up their former opinions, but only as adopting for them a more definite expression. Of course, therefore, they continued to hold their predecessors, who were Eusebians or Semiarians, as orthodox, although condemned in the West as heretics.[26] Thus the canons of the councils held in the East during the schism at Antioch, A. D. 341, Laodicea (perhaps A. D. 363),[27] and Gangra (between 362 and 370), were still maintained in the East, and at length were adopted even in the West.[28]

Nicæno-Constantinopol. expositum et ex antiquitate ecclesiastica illustratum. Traj. ad. Rhen. 1718. 4to. Directly after the close of the council, Theodosius passed the law of July 30, 381 (*Cod. Theodos.* XVI. 1, 3): Episcopis tradi omnes Ecclesias mox jubemus, qui unius majestatis atque virtutis Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum confitentur, ejusdem gloriæ, claritatis unius: nihil dissonum profana divisione facientes, sed Trinitatis ordinem, personarum adsertionem, et divinitatis unitatem: quos constabit communione *Nectarii* Episc. Constantinopolitanæ Ecclesiæ, *Timothei* necnon intra Ægyptum Alexandrinæ Urbis Episcopo esse sociatos: quos etiam in *Orientis* partibus *Pelagio* Ep. Laodicensi, et *Diodoro* Ep. Tarsensi; in *Asia* necnon proconsulari atque Asiana Diœcesi *Amphilochio* Ep. Iconiensi, et *Optimo* Ep. Antiocheno (of Antioch in Pisidia); in *Pontica* diœcesi *Helladio* Ep. Cæsariensi, et *Otrejo* Meliteno, et *Gregorio* Ep. Nysseno; *Terennio* Ep. Scythiæ, *Marmario* Ep. Marcianop. communicare constiterit: hos ad obtinendas catholicas Ecclesias ex communione et consortio probabilium Sacerdotum oportebit admitti, etc. So also laws against heretics, which were often repeated. See *Cod. Theodos.* XVI. 5, *de Hæreticis* L. 6–14. 16. 17. 19. 21–23.

24 At the instance of his mother, Justina, Cod. Th. XVI. 1, 4. (A. D. 386) cf. Ambros. epist. 32 et 33 (al. 13. 14). Rufini hist. eccl. II. 15.

25 During his residence with Theodosius, when driven from his kingdom by Maximus. His law against the heretics A. D. 388, Cod. Theod. XVI. 5, 15. cf. Gothofred. ad h. legem.

26 Thus Basil praises Dianius (see above, § 81, note 7); Gregor. Naz. (Orat. III. p. 88 seq.), Sozom. (V. 10.), Theodoret. (III. 3,) the Semiarian Marcus, bishop of Arethusa, as a Christian martyr.

27 Gratiani Decreti P. I. Dist. 16, c. 11, says of the canons of this council: Quorum rector maxime Theodosius Episcopus extitit; whence Gothofredus ad Philos. (v. Pagi crit. ann. 314, no. 25,) supposes it to have been convened by the Eunomian Theodosius, bishop of Philadelphia in Lydia. cf. Philostorg. VIII. c. 4.

28 *Innocentius* I., *Ep.* 7 *ad Constantinopolitanos*, A. D. 405, speaks of these canons as ab hæreticis compositos, — non solum non sequendos, verum etiam una cum hæreticis et schismaticis dogmatibus condemnandos: Still they were retained in the East; the council of Chalcedon appeals to them Act 4: soon after, they were translated with the Greek Codex canonum in the Prisca versio, and from that time were held in high repute in the West also. *Zacharias Ep.* 7 *ad Pipinum* calls them beatorum patrum sanctiones, *Nicolaus* I. *Ep.* 9 *ad Michaelem Imp.* venerabiles Antiochenos et sacros canones. Hence modern Catholic writers have attempted to distinguish two councils of Antioch, the one Catholic, and the other Eusebian. *Eman. a Schelstrate* sacr. Antiochenum concil. pro Arianorum conciliabulo passim habitum, nunc vero primum ex antiquitate auctoritati suæ restitutum. Antverp. 1681. 4to. *P. et H. fratres Ballerinii* de antiquis collectionibus canonum P. I. c. 4, § 2 (in the Appendix to the *Opp. Leonis M. Venet.* 1757. *reprinted in A. Gallandii de vetustis canonum collectionibus dissertationum sylloge. Venet.* 1778. *fol. Mogunt.* 1790. *Tomi* II. 4to.)

§ 82.

HISTORY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SCIENCES DURING THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY.

Of the theological schools of this period, the most distinguished were that of Origen, and the Syrian historico-exegetical school, both of which originated in the preceding period. Origen was universally held in high esteem, and to the wide-extended influence of his writings it is to be attributed, that, in the midst of these furious controversies, there remained any freedom of theological speculation whatever. In the great questions of the day he was appealed to by both parties;[1] for, whilst the Arians proved from his writings and those of his followers, that the Son was a created being, Athanasius drew from the same source arguments for the eternal generation of the Logos.[2] Men were too well practised in the art of reconciling the opinions of the Fathers with the more modern views in theology,[3] to be perplexed by the contradictory passages in his writings. Thus Origen had his adherents in both parties. Amongst the Eusebians, the most remarkable was *Eusebius Pamphili*, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine (A. D. 340), distinguished alike for his pacific spirit and his great merits in the department of church history.[4]

---

1 Hence the contradictory opinions concerning him: *Epiphanius, hær.* 64, *c.* 4, accuses him of being the father of Arianism: whilst *Socrates*, VII. 6, wonders how Timotheus could have been at the same time an admirer of Origen, and an Arian, since Origen *συναΐδιον παντάχοῦ ὁμολογεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τῷ πατρί.*

2 See above, § 61, note 14. Comp. Münschers Dogmengeschichte, Bd. 3. S. 416, 418 ff.

3 Vid. Münscher, l. c. S. 156 ff. 422. ff.

4 His biography by his successor, Acacius, (*Socrat.* II. 4,) is no longer extant. He is called an Arian by Athanasius, Epiphanius, Hilarius, Hieronymus, etc., defended by *Socrat. II.* 21, and *Gelasius hist. syn. Nic. II.* 1. The first are followed by most historians, Baronius, Petavius (dogm. theol. de trin. lib. II. c. 11.), Jac. Basnage, etc. His orthodoxy is defended by Valesius, Bull, *Du Pin*, Sam. Basnage. Contest on the subject between Jo. Clericus, who accuses him of Arianism, (bibliothèque univ. T. X. p. 380. Epistolæ criticæ s. Artis criticæ, vol. III. p. 28 seq.), and W. Cave, who defends him from the charge (diss. de Eusebii Arianismo in the Append. II. hist. literar. Script. Eccl. p. 42 and Epist. apolog. ibid. p. 61 seq.) — More correct the opinion of *Chr. D. A. Martini* Eusebii Cæs. de divinitate Christi sententia. Rostoch. 1795. 4to. *J. Ritter* Eusebii Cæs. de divinitate Christi placita. Bonnæ. 1823. 4to. Writings: *Hist. eccles.* libb. X. *Chronicon s. παντοδαπὴ ἱστορία (Jos. Jus. Scaliger* thesaur. temporum. Lugd. Bat. 1606. auct. ed. *A. Morus.* Amst. 1658. fol. ex vers. Armen. ed. *J. Bapt. Aucher.* Venet. 2 T. 1818. 4to. *Ang. Majus* et *J. Zohrab.* Mediol. 1818. 4to.) Προπαρασκευὴ εὐαγγελικὴ libb. 15 ed. F. Vigerus. Paris. 1628. fol. Εὐαγγελικὴ ἀπόδειξις libb. 20, (of this lib. I. — X ed. Par. 1628. fol. The beginning of the first book and the close of the tenth have been added by *J. A. Fabricius* in his Delectus argumentorum et syllabus scriptt. qui veritatem relig. Christ. adseruerunt. Hamb. 1725. 4to. p. 1 seq.) — *Contra Hieroclem* liber. *Contra Marcellum* libb. 2 *De ecclesiastica Theologia* libb. 3. (all in the appendix to the Demonstr. Evangel.). Περὶ

Amongst the Nicenians were *Athanasius*, the father of orthodoxy, from the year 326 bishop of Alexandria, though repeatedly driven from his place and again recalled (+ A. D. 373);[5] *Basil, the great*, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia from the year 370 (+ A. D. 379);[6] Basil's brother *Gregory*, bishop of Nyssa in Cappadocia from the year 370 (+ about A. D. 394);[7] *Gregory of Nazianzum*, ὁ θεόλογος, the intimate friend of Basil, bishop of Constantinople from the year 380–381 (+ A. D. 390);[8] and *Didymus*, the head of the catachetical school at Alexandria (+ A. D. 395.)[9] Even in the West, too, Origen's influence was felt, and the most important writers of the day, *Hilarius*, bishop of Pictavium from the year 350, exiled to Phrygia from 356–360 (+ A. D. 368),[10] and *Ambrosius*, bishop of Medio-

---

τῶν τοπικῶν ἐν τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ (cum vers. Hieronymi ed. *J. Clericus*. Amst. 1707.). *Oratio de laudibus Constantini. De vita Constantini* libb. 4to. (affixed to the hist. eccl.). *Canones sacr. Evangeliorum X.* (in Bibl. PP.) *Comm. in Cant. Canticorum, in Psalmos, in Esaiam.* cf. *Fabricii* bibl. Gr. ed. *Harles*, vol. VII. p. 335 seq.

5 Of his works the most remarkable Ἀπολογητικὸς κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν (about A. D. 349). Ἀπολογία πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Κωνστάντιον (A. D. 356). Ἀπολογία περὶ τῆς φυγῆς αὐτοῦ (A. D. 357). Ἐπιστολὴ τοῖς τὸν μονήρη βίον ἀσκοῦσι s. historia Arianorum ad Monachos (A. D. 358). — Κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν λόγοι γ'. — Ἐπιστολὴ περὶ τῶν γενομένων ἐν τῇ Ἀριμίνῳ τῆς Ἰταλίας καὶ ἐν Σελευκείᾳ τῆς Ἰσαυρίας συνόδων (A. D. 359), etc. *Opp. ed. Bern. de Montfaucon.* Paris. 1698. 3 T. fol. *N. A. Justiniani.* Patav. 1777. 4 T. fol. cf. *Fabricius-Harles*, vol. VIII. p. 171 seq.

6 Ἀντιῤῥητικὸς τοῦ Ἀπολογητικοῦ τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς Ἐυνομίου libb. V. — Περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. Homilies, ascetic writings, letters. *Opp. ed. Fronto Ducæus.* Paris. 1618. 2 vols. fol. *Jul. Garnier.* Par. 1721–30. 3 vols. fol. cf. *Fabricius-Harles*, vol. IX. p. 1 seq.

7 Κατὰ Ἐυνομίου libb. XIII. — contra Apollinarem, see note 23. — περὶ τῆς ἑξαημέρου. — Λόγος κατηχητικὸς ὁ μέγας. Homilies, ascetic writings. ed. *F. Morellius.* Paris. 1615. 2 vols. Append. add. *J. Gretser* ibid. 1618. fol. cf. *Fabricius-Harles*, vol. IX. p. 98 seq.

8 Orations, (especially de theologia oratt. V.), letters, poems. *Opp. ed. F. Morellius.* Paris. 1630. (Colon. 1690.) 2 vols. fol. *Clemencet*, vol. I. Paris. 1778. cf. *Fabricius-Harles*, vol. VIII. p. 383. Gregorius v. Nazianz, der Theologe, von D. C. Ullmann. Darmstadt. 1825. 8vo.

9 Of him vid. *Guerike de schola Alex.* P. I. p. 92 seq. His bibl. commentary, and his Comm. in libros Origenis περὶ ἀρχῶν, with many other writings, are no longer extant. Still extant are Lib. de Spiritu S. according to the Latin translation of Jerome (in *Hieron. Opp. ed. Martian.* T. IV P. I. p. 494 seq); Lib. adv. Manichæos (gr. et lat. in *Combefisii Auctarium græc.* PP. P. II. p. 21 et in *Canisii lect. ant.* ed. Basnage vol. I. p. 204 seq.); De Trinitate libb. III *(prim. ed. J. A. Mingarelli. Bonon.* 1769. *fol.)*; Brevis enarratio in Epist. canonicas, extant in the Latin translation of the Scholasticus of Epiphanius, which was made at the suggestion of Cassiodorus *(Cassiod. de instit. div. scr. c.* 8), also in *Bibl. max.* PP. T. IV. p. 319 seq. Best of all in Lücke, 'Quæstiones et vindiciæ Didymianæ.' Gott. 1829. 4to., where it is accompanied by the Greek text, partially restored from the Scholia of Matthäi. Vid. Lücke's Comm. über d. Schriften Johannes, Th. 3, S. 300 ff.

10 De trinitate libb. XII. Ad Constantium lib. De Synodis adv. Arianos. De Synodis Ariminensi et Seleuciensi (Fragments). Various commentaries. Concerning the Comm. in Psalmos plurimos vid. *Hieron. cat. c.* 100: in quo opere imitatus Origenem, nonnulla etiam de suo addidit; of the tractatus in Job: quos de Græco Origenis ad sensum transtulit, now no longer extant, cf. *Rosenmuller* hist. interpret. libr. sacr. in eocl. christ. P. III p. 301 seq. *Opp.* edd. Monachi Congreg. S. Mauri *(P. Coustant)*. Paris. 1693. *Sc. Maffeus.* Veron. 1730. 2 vols. fol.

lanum from the year 374, (+ A. D. 397,)[11] honored him as their master. To these must be added two distinguished monks, of Western origin, though they resided in Palestine, *Rufinus Toranius* of Aquileia, who had been six years a pupil of Didymus at Alexandria, and since the year 378 lived a hermit in the Mount of Olives (+ A. D. 410), and *Sophronius Eusebius Hieronymus* of Stridon, the best biblical critic of his time, who was at the head of a society of monks at Bethlehem from the year 386 (+ A. D. 420).[12]

Whilst Origen was thus popular, the historico-exegetical system, likewise, which originated in Syria and the neighbouring countries, was not without its followers.[13] Amongst the earlier Eusebians, these were *Theodorus*, bishop of Heraclea (+ about A. D. 358),[14] *Eusebius*, bishop of Emesa (+ A. D. 360),[15] and *Cyril*, bishop of Jerusalem, who afterwards adopted the decrees of the council of Nice, and was present at the council of Constantinople (A. D. 381), (+ A. D. 386.)[16] Amongst the Nicenians in the East, *Apollinaris*, bishop of

---

[11] De officiis Ministrorum libb. 3. De fide libb. 5. De Spiritu Sancto libb. 3. A comm. of no value on some of the psalms, in Lucam libb. 10 (*cf. Rosenmüller* l. c. p. 315 seq.). Epistolæ 92, etc. Opp. ed. Mon. Congreg. S. Mauri. Paris. 1686. 90. 2 voll. fol.

[12] Jerome, writing to Paula, speaks thus of Origen (Rufin. invectiv. in Hieron. lib. II.; see Hieron. opp. ed. Martianay, vol. IV. T. II. p. 68 and 480): Quis enim unquam tanta legere potuit, quanta ipse conscripsit? Pro hoc sudore, quid accepit pretii? Damnatur a Demetrio episcopo: exceptis Palæstinæ et Arabiæ et Phœnices atque Achajæ sacerdotibus in damnationem ejus (*leg.* orbis) consentit: urbs Roma ipsa contra hunc cogit senatum, non propter dogmatum novitatem, non propter hæresin, ut nunc adversum eum rabidi canes simulant, sed quia gloriam eloquentiæ ejus et scientiæ ferre non poterant, et illo dicente omnes muti putabantur.

[13] cf. *J. A. Ernesti* narratio crit. de interpretatione prophetiarum messian. in *Opp. theoll.* p. 498 seq. F. Münter on the Antiochian school, in Stäudlin's and Tzschirner's Archiv für Kirchengesch. Bd. 1. St. 1. S. 13 ff.

[14] *Hieronymi catal. c.* 90: Theodorus Heracliæ Thraciarum Episcopus, elegantis apertique sermonis, et magis historicæ intelligentiæ, edidit sub Constantio Principe commentarios in Matthæum, et in Joannem, et in Apostolum, et in Psalterium. See the Fragments in Cotelerii Catena in Matt. Antverp. 1642. The comm. to the Psalms in Cotelerii Catena in Psalmos. Antv. 1643.

[15] Concerning him see *Socrates* II. 9. and Sozomenus III. 6. Both say of him: ὑπέμεινε δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς μέμψιν, ὡς τὰ Σαβελλίου φρονῶν. On the other hand *Hieronymus in chron. ad ann. X. Constantii* calls him: Arianæ signifer factionis. cf. *Hieron. cat. c.* 91: Eusebius Emesenus Episcopus, elegantis et Rhetorici ingenii, innumerabiles, et qui ad plausum populi pertinent, confecit libros, magisque historiam secutus, ab his qui declamare volunt, studiosissime legitur: e quibus vel præcipui sunt adv. Judæos, et Gentes, et Novatianos, et ad Galatas libb. X. et in Evangelia homiliæ breves sed plurimæ. His character as a critic is more distinctly drawn c. 119. (see note 19). Of his speeches many are still extant in MSS. vid. *Fabricii Bibl. Gr. ed. Harles, vol.* VII. p. 412 *not.* — *Eusebii Emes. orat. in sacr. Parasceues diem e duobus Codd. Vindobon. prim. ed. ab Ch. G. Augusti. Bonnæ.* 1820. 4to. A fragment is preserved, also, in *Theodoreti Eranistes dial.* III. in edit. Schulzii T. IV. p. 258 seq.

[16] Catecheses XVIII. ad Competentes. Catecheses Mystag. V. (their authenticity is questioned, more especially by *Oudinus de scripti. eccl. ant. vol.* I. *p.* 459 *seq.*) ed. *Th. Milles. Oxon.* 1703. *fol. A. A. Touttée. Paris.* 1720. *fol.* The Semiarianism of Cyril is acknowledged by Touttée, especially in the Dissert Cyrill. p. XI. seq.

Laodicea (between A. D. 370 and 390),[17] afterwards known by his heresy concerning the person of Christ; *Ephraem*, Diaconus in Edessa, (propheta Syrorum,) (+ A. D. 378);[18] and *Diodorus*, presbyter at Antioch, from 378 bishop of Tarsus (+ before 394).[19] This last was the instructer of *John Chrysostom*, A. D. 381 Diaconus, A. D. 386 presbyter at Antioch, A. D. 398 bishop of Constantinople (+ A. D. 407);[20] and *Theodorus*, presbyter at Antioch, from the year 393 bishop of Mopsuestia, (+ A. D. 429,)[21] the most distinguished critic of the Syrian school.

The different principles pursued by these two schools, in their criti-

---

(to which indeed Epiphanius, hær. LXXIII. c. 27, bears express testimony), and an attempt was made in the Jesuit publication, Mémoires de Trevoux (mois de Décem. 1721), to refute him; which was answered by Prudentius Maranus diss. sur les Sémiariens. Paris. 1722. 8vo. reprinted in *Vogt bibl. hist. hæresiolog.* T. II. p. 115 seq. Concerning his criticisms in the Catecheses, vid. *Catech.* XIII. c. 9: *συνεληλύθαμεν γὰρ, οὐ γραφῶν ἐξήγησιν θεωρητικὴν ποιήσασθαι νῦν, ἀλλὰ πιστοποιηθῆναι μᾶλλον περὶ ὧν πεπιστεύκαμεν.* cf. *Fabricius-Harles*, vol. VIII. p. 437 seq. Tzschirner Opusc. acad. p. 253.

[17] His writings (Adv. Porphyrium libb. XXX. contra Eunomium, etc.) are all lost. In the Catenæ many of his interpretations of the Scriptures are preserved. Philostorgius ap. Suidam s. v. Apollinaris prefers him to Basil and Gregory Nazianzen: *οὗτος γὰρ δὴ καὶ τῆς Ἑβραΐδος διαλέκτου ἐπαΐειν οἷός τε ἦν.* cf. *Fabricius-Harles*, vol. VIII. p. 588 seq.

[18] Homilies. Ascetic writings. Hymns. Particularly important his Syrian comm. on the Old Testament. Opp. græca et syr. ed. *St. Evod. Assemanus.* Romæ. 1732–45. 6 voll. fol. cf. *Fabricius-Harles*, vol. VIII. p. 217 seq.

[19] *Hieron. cat. c.* 119: Diodorus Tarsensis Episcopus, dum Antiochiæ esset presbyter, magis claruit. Extant ejus in Apostolum commentarii, et multa alia, ad Eusebii magis Emiseni characterem pertinentia: cujus cum sensum secutus sit, eloquentiam imitari non potuit propter ignorantiam sæcularium literarum. *Socrat.* VI. 3: *πολλὰ βιβλία συνέγραψε, ψιλῷ τῷ γράμματι τῶν θείων προσέχων γραφῶν, τὰς θεωρίας αὐτῶν ἐκτρεπόμενος.* For his orthodoxy, which has been called in question, vid. *Facundi Ep. Hermianensis* (about A. D. 548) *pro defensione trium Capitulorum lib.* IV. c. 2. His writings are all lost, but a catalogue of them was made by Ebedjesu in *Assemani* Bibl. Orient. T. III. P. I. p. 28. cf. *Fabricius-Harles*, vol. IX. p. 278 seq. Fragments in Marius Mercator, Photius (*cod.* 122), and others. It is possible that the Chaldean Christians, amongst whom he was in high repute, (see *Assemani* l. c. T. III. P. II. p. 224), may have preserved some of his writings in translation.

[20] The name Chrysostom was given to him afterwards; vid. *Johannes Moscus*, (about A. D. 630), pratum spirit. c. 131; not in general use till after the VI. Conc. A. D. 680. His works are: Orations (especially his Homilies on the New Testament), Ascetic writings, Letters, *περὶ ἱερωσύνης* libb. VI. (*ed. J. A. Bengel Stuttg.* 1725. 8vo. translated by K. F. Hasselbach. Stralsund. 1820. 8vo. by J. Ritter. Berlin. 1821. 8vo). *Opp. ed. B. de Montfaucon. Paris.* 1718–38. 13 *voll. fol.* — cf. *Fabricius-Harles*, vol. VIII. p. 454 seq. A. Neander der h. Joh. Chrysostomus u. die Kirche bes. des Orients in dessen Zeitalter. Berlin. 1821–22. 2 Bde. 8vo.

[21] His biblical commentaries are unfortunately lost with the rest of his writings, except a few fragments. The Chaldean Christians, who call him the Interpreter, (*Assemani* l. c. T. III. P. I. p. 36), and have made his interpretations their standard, (*Assem.* l. c. T. III. P. II. p. 227), have preserved some of his criticisms in translation. A catalogue of his works by Ebedjesu *Assemani* T. III. P. I. p. 30. cf. *Fabricius-Harles, vol. X. p.* 346 *seq.* Some fragments in F. Münter fragmenta patrum græcorum. Hafn. 1788. 8. fasc. I. p. 72 seq. Others in the Acts of the *Conc. œcum.* V. A. D. 553, *Facundus pro defens. trium Capit.* libb. III. IX. X. *Joannes Philoponus* (about A. D. 600), de mundi creatione (in *Gallandii Bibl. PP. T. XII. p.* 473), and *Leontius Byzantinus*, (about A. D. 610),

cism of the scriptures, led naturally to some writings of a controversial character.[22] Their disputes were entirely scientific, however, and did not blind them to each other's merits. Jerome, for instance, though a follower of Origen, made great use of the Syrian interpreters; whilst the Syrian Chrysostom sought to find a middle path between the principles of interpretation of his own school, and those of Origen.[23] We find, as yet, no trace of controversy on points of faith.[24] The peculiar opinions of Origen were neither adopted by his followers amongst the orthodox, nor condemned as heresy. A considerably wide range of topics was still left open to investigation;[25] and the zeal with which the question of the relation of the Son to the Father was discussed, made this point so entirely the test of orthodoxy, that on all others the utmost freedom of inquiry was permitted, as long as the Arian controversy lasted. Gregory of Nyssa[26] and Didymus[27] were

---

contra Nestor. et Eutych. lib. III. (ibid. p. 686 seq.). Of his *Comm. in XII. Proph.* extant in 8 Codd. *Angelus Majus (Scriptorum vett. nova collect. e Vat. codd. edita Tom. I. Rom.* 1825. *p.* 41 *seq.)* has published the *Comm. in Jon. Abd. et Nah.* complete, and the proœmia to the other four. cf. *Ernesti* opusc. theol. p. 502 seq. *Rosenmuller* hist. interpret. P. III. p. 250 seq. *Münter* im Archive f. KG. Bd. 1. St. I. S. 17 ff. *F. L. Sieffert Theodorus Mopsv. veteris Test. sobrie interpretandi vindex comm. Regiomonti.* 1827. 8vo. who gives, also, fragments never before printed, from the *Comm. in XII. Proph.* See the complaints of Leontius against Theodore (*Gallandius* l. c.) XII. aggreditur — gloriam Spiritus sancti, cum omnes quidem scripturas altas, quas sancti afflatu ejus tradiderunt, humiliter et demisse interpretans, tum vero a numero sacrarum scripturarum — eas separans. XIV. Epistolam Jacobi et alias deinceps aliorum catholicas abrogat et antiquat. XV. Inscriptiones Hymnorum, et Psalmorum, et Cantiorum penitus ejecit, et omnes Psalmos judaice ad Zorobabelem et Ezechiam retulit, tribus tantum ad Dominum rejectis. XVI. Immo et sanctorum sanctissimum canticum canticorum — libidinose pro sua et mente et lingua meretricia interpretans, sua supra modum incredibili audacia ex libris sacris abscidit. XVII. Duos libros Paralipomenon — et insuper Esdram repudiavit.

[22] The followers of Origen, like their master, sought to prove the grammatical mode of interpretation inadmissible, and the allegorical necessary. e. g. *Gregorius Nyssenus* proœm. in Cant. Cant. *Hieronymus* passim. They were answered by Diodorus, according to *Suidas s. v.* Διόδωρος. *τίς διαφορὰ θεωρίας καὶ ἀλληγορίας.* Comp. *Ernesti opusc. theol. p.* 499. Still more energetically by Theodorus Mopsv. (*Facundus* III. c. 6): in libro *de allegoria et historia*, quem contra Origenem scripsit, unde et odium Origenianorum incurrit. Ebedjesu cites amongst Theodore's works, *quinque tomos adv. Allegoricos (Assemani Bibl. or. T.* III. P. I. p. 34. cf. p. 19).

[23] Vid. *Ernesti* opusc. theol. p. 512.

[24] *Theophili Alex. lib. paschalis* I. Hieronymo interprete (*Hier. opp. ed. Martian.* T. IV. P. II. p. 694): Licet (Apollinaris) adversus Arianos, et Eunomianos scripserit, et *Origenem*, aliosque hæreticos sua disputatione subverterit, tamen, etc. Thus, too, Apollinaris defended Chiliasm in a work περὶ ἀναστάσεως. *Basil. Ep.* 263 (*al.* 74.) § 4. *Hieron. proœm. in. libr.* XVIII. *Iesaiæ. Epiph. hær.* LXXVII. § 36.

[25] *Gregor. Naz. Orat.* 33 (*de Theol.* I.) in fine: φιλοσόφει μοι περὶ κόσμου η κόσμων, περὶ ὕλης, περὶ ψυχῆς, περὶ λογικῶν φύσεων βελτιόνων τε καὶ χειρόνων, περὶ ἀναστάσεως, κρίσεως, ἀνταποδόσεως, Χριστοῦ παθημάτων. Ἐν τούτοις γὰρ καὶ τὸ ἐπιτυγχάνειν οὐκ ἄχρηστον, καὶ τὸ διαμαρτάνειν ἀκίνδυνον.

[26] Vid. *Jo. Dallæus* de pœnis et satisfactionibus humanis (libb. VII. Amst. 1649. 4to. lib. IV.) c. 7. p. 368 seq. Münscher's Dogmengesch. Bd. 4. S. 439. 465. Wundemann's Gesch. d. christl. Glaubenslehren, Th. 2. S. 463.

[27] On his theology, see *Guerike de schola Alex.* P. II. p. 332 seq. Especially on

known as Origenists, and many others held to single points of Origen's creed,[28] without being therefore attacked. Synesius went still further, and openly professed his New-Platonic convictions,* though he was, notwithstanding, consecrated as bishop of Ptolemais (A. D. 410). The belief in the unalienable power of amendment in all intelligent beings, and the limited duration of future punishment,[29] was so general even in the West,[30] and amongst the opponents of Origen,[31] that it seemed entirely independent of his system, to which, doubtless, its origin must be traced.

Nor would the consequences have been other than advantageous, if the Syrian school, which adhered more strictly to the scriptures in its theology,[32] had been led to attack some of Origen's paradoxes. A far greater danger now threatened all free inquiry and scientific research, from another side. In proportion as Monachism gained strength, the prejudice strengthened against all use of human science or learning.[33] There arose a crowd of *traditional* theologians, who, rejecting all free investigation, would hear of no opinion which could not be found in the writings of the fathers. This character we see exemplified in Epiphanius, bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, from the

---

the possibility of the return of the Devil, p. 359, 368, and on the preëxistence of souls, p. 361. Gregory Nazianzen declares decidedly against this last. (Ullmann, S. 414 seq.).

[28] Hilarius, doctrine of the humanity of Christ (see Münscher, Bd. 4. S. 20 ff.) and that of C. M. Victorinus philos. (about A. D. 368), in comm. in Ep. ad Eph. i. 4. (Maii scriptt. vett. nova collect. T. III. P. II. p. 90–93, seq.) are evidently Origenistic.

* Synesius ep. 105, ad fratrem Euoptium. cf. Evagrius, l. c. 15. Photius. cod. 26. Comp. Synesios des Kyraenaers Rede an Arkados. München. 1825. 8vo. cf. L. Holstenii diss. de Synesio. ed. Valesii. p. 202.

[29] *Hieronymus ad Gal.* 5, 22: nullam rationabilium creaturarum apud Deum perire perpetuo. cf. *ad Eph.* 4, 16. *Ambrosiaster in Eph.* 3, 10. cf. *J. A. Dietelmair* commenti fanatici de rerum omnium ἀποκαταστάσει hist. antiquior. Altorfii. 1769. 8vo. p. 160 seq.

[30] *Augustin. Enchirid. ad Laurent. c.* 112: Frustra nonnulli, immo quam plurimi, æternam damnatorum pœnam et cruciatus sine intermissione perpetuos humano miserentur affectu, atque ita futurum esse non credunt: non quidem scripturis divinis adversando, sed pro suo modo dura quæque molliendo et in leniorem flectendo sententiam, quæ putant in eis terribilius esse dicta quam verius. Non enim obliviscetur, inquiunt, misereri Deus, aut continebit in ira sua miserationes suas.

[31] For instance, Diodorus of Tarsus, and Theodorus of Mopsuestia, whose expressions on the subject have been preserved by Solomon, bishop of Bassora (about A. D. 1222), in *Assemani* Bibl. Or. T. III. P. I. p. 313 seq. Concerning Theodore cf. *Photii Cod.* 81. *Marius Mercator p.* 246, ed. Baluzii.

[32] *Cyrilli Hieros. cat.* IV. c. 17: Δεῖ γὰρ περὶ τῶν θείων καὶ ἁγίων τῆς πίστεως μυστηρίων μηδὲ τὸ τυχὸν ἄνευ τῶν θείων παραδίδοσθαι γραφῶν, καὶ μὴ ἁπλῶς πιθανότησι καὶ λόγων κατασκευαῖς παραφέρεσθαι. Μηδὲ ἐμοὶ τῷ ταῦτά σοι λέγοντι ἁπλῶς πιστεύσης, ἐὰν τὴν ἀπόδειξιν τῶν καταγγελλομένων ἀπὸ τῶν θείων μὴ λάβῃς γραφῶν. So in many passages of his catecheses, vid. *Touttée diss.* II. prefixed to his ed. of Cyril, p. 129 seq.

[33] Vid. Münscher's Dogmengesch. Bd. 3. S. 47 ff.

year 367 (+ 403).[34] Even in his *Panarion* (hær. 63 and 64) he betrays his bitter hatred of Origen; and as soon as the Arian controversy was at an end, he appeared as his open assailant. Whilst this new contest stopped the advance of theological science in the East, the Western world was bound in spiritual bondage by Augustine, and thus all free inquiry banished from the church.

II. THE ORIGENISTIC AND PELAGIAN CONTROVERSIES.

§ 83.

FATE OF ORIGEN'S FOLLOWERS.

Vid. Walch's Hist. d. Ketzereien, Th. 7. S. 427 ff.

At the close of the Arian controversy, the Christians of Palestine were mostly the followers of Origen. Amongst these, the most distinguished were John, bishop of Jerusalem (A. D. 386–417), and the two monks, Rufinus and Jerome. In the year 394, Epiphanius appeared at Jerusalem, and demanded with great zeal the condemnation of Origen. He was denied and resisted by John and Rufinus, whilst Jerome, more anxious for his orthodoxy, yielded, and broke off all communion with the church of Jerusalem.[1] By the efforts of Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, he was induced to renew it. But that same year (A. D. 397) Rufinus went to Rome, and attempted, by a revised translation of the writings of Origen, which were as yet but imperfectly known in the West,[2] to give a more favorable view

---

[34] His writings: Ἀγκυρωτὸς s. de fide sermo. Πανάριον s adv. hæreses. — *Opp. ed. D. Petavius. Paris.* 1622. (*Colon.* 1682). 2 *voll. fol.*

[1] *Hieronymi* lib. ad Pammachium contra Joann. Hieros. (vid. Martianay epist. 38). Origen is here accused of the following errors (comp. § 62, note 12): 1. In libro περὶ ἀρχῶν (I. 1, § 8) loquitur: Sicut enim incongruum est dicere, quod possit filius videre patrem, ita inconveniens est opinari, quod spiritus s. possit videre filium, 2. quod in hoc corpore quasi in carcere sunt animæ religatæ, et, antequam homo fieret in paradiso, inter rationales creaturas in cœlestibus commoratæ sunt, 3. quod dicat, et diabolum et dæmones acturos pœnitentiam aliquando et cum sanctis ultimo tempore regnaturos, 4. quod tunicas pelliceas humana corpora interpretur, quibus post offensam et ejectionem de paradiso Adam et Eva induti sunt, 5. quod carnis resurrectionem, membrorumque compagem, et sexum, quo viri dividimur a fœminis, apertissime peget, 6. quod sic Paradisum allegorizet, ut historiæ auferat veritatem, pro arboribus angelos, pro fluminibus virtutes cœlestes intelligens, totamque paradisi continentiam tropologica interpretatione subvertat, 7. quod aquas, quæ super cœlos in scripturis esse dicuntur, sanctas supernasque virtutes; quæ super terram et infra terram, contrarias et dæmoniacas esse arbitretur, 8. quod imaginem et similitudinem dei, ad quam homo conditus fuerat, dicit ab eo perditam, et in homine post paradisum non fuisse.

[2] *Anastasii* I. Epist. ad Joh. Hierosol. A. D. 401 (ap Coustant. p. 719): Origenes autem, cujus in nostram linguam [Rufinus] composita derivavit, antea et quis fuerit, et in quæ processerit verba, nostrum propositum [studium?] nescit.

of his theological opinions. This brought on a violent dispute between him and Jerome.[3] Origen having been condemned, however, in Egpyt, Anastasius, bishop of Rome, also declared against him. Rufinus retreated to Aquileia, and continued to employ himself in translating Greek works (+ 410);[4] whilst Jerome, on his part, had the merit of greatly improving the Latin translation of the Bible, and furnishing many valuable commentaries, (+ 420.)[5]

Soon after these controversies in Palestine, the ambitious and violent Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria (A. D. 385–412), came forward as the bitter enemy of Origen.[6] The monks of his diocese were divided into two parties, the followers of Origen, and the Anthropomorphites. Influenced by personal hatred to certain individuals of the former party, and intimidated by the fanaticism of the latter, Theophilus was induced to condemn the opinions of Origen (A. D. 399, 400), and, calling on all the other bishops to do the same,[7] he persecuted all those who had adopted them, with the greatest cruelty. These unfortunates betook themselves, at last, to Constantinople, where John Chrysostom, to whom Theophilus had always been opposed, had been bishop since the year 398, greatly beloved by all the virtuous amongst his clergy, though hated by the corrupt, and especially by a luxurious

---

Augustini Ep. ad Hieron. 40: Illud de prudentia doctrinaque tua desiderabam, et adhuc desidero, ut nota nobis facias ea ipsa ejus [Origenis] errata, quibus a fide veritatis ille vir tantus recessisse convincitur.

[3] *Rufini* præfatio ad Orig. περὶ ἀρχῶν. — (Pammachii et Oceani Ep. ad Hieron. vid. Martianay Ep. 40, Vallarsi Ep. 83). *Hieronymus* ad Pammachium et Oceanum de erroribus Origenis (Martian. Ep. 41, Vallarsi Ep. 84). — *Rufini* Apologia s. invectivarum in Hieronym. libb. II. — *Hieronymi* Apologia adv. Rufinum libb. II. — (Rufini Ep. ad Hieron. lost). — *Hieronymi* responsio s. Apologiæ l. III.

[4] Origenis libb. περὶ ἀρχῶν et Homiliæ, Pamphili Apol. pro Origene, Josephi opp. — Eusebii hist. eccl. — Clementis Recognitiones. — Basilii M. et Gregor. Naz. opp. nonnulla. — Vitæ Patrum. Also Expositio symboli Apostolici, Hist. eccl. libb. II. Comm. in Hoseam, Joel, cæt. — Comp. *Jo. Franc. B. Mar. de Rubeis* monumenta eccl. Aquilejensis. Argentinæ. 1740. fol. p. 80 seq. *idem* de Turannio s. Tyrannio Rufino. Venetiis. 1754.

[5] A revision of the Latin translation of the New Testament (cf. Epistola ad Damasum s. Hieron. in Evangelistas ad Damasum præf.) — Psalterium Romanum (A. D. 382) — Psalterium Gallicanum. — New translation of the Old Testament. (385–405). — Comm. in Ecclesiasten, Prophetas, in Evang. Matthæi, in Ep. ad Galatas, Ephesios, ad Titum, ad Philemonem. — Catalogus Script. Eccles. A. D. 392 (in *J. A. Fabricii* biblioth. eccles. Hamb. 1718. fol.) Interpretatio nominum Hebraicarum (388). — Polemic writings adv. Helvīdium, Jovinianum, Vigilantium, Luciferianos, Pelagianos, cæt. — Letters, Translations *Euseb.* de situ et nominibus locorum Hebr., (gr. et lat. ed. *J. Clericus*. Amst. 1707. fol.) Chronicon. *Origenis* homil. II. in Cant. Cant. — Letters of Theophilus and Epiphanius. *Opp. ed. Jo. Martianay*. Paris. 1693 — 1706. T. 5. fol. *Dom. Vallarsi* Veron. 1734–42. vol. XI. fol. — Hieron. Leben von Joh. Stilting (Act. SS. Sept. T. VIII. p. 413 seq.).

[6] Vid. *Palladii* Episc. Helenopolit. dial. de vita S. Joh. Chrysostomi (prim. græce ed. *Emer. Bigot*. Paris. 1680. 4to. in Chrysost. opp. ed. *Montfaucon*, T. 13). *Socrates* VI. 3–18. *Sozomenus* VIII. 7–20. — *Joh. Stilting* de S. Chrysostomo comm. historicus in Act. SS. Sept. T. IV. p. 401 seq. A. Neander der h. Joh. Chrysostomus und die Kirche, bes. des Orients, in dessen Zeitalter (2 Bde. Berlin. 1821–22. 8vo.), Bd. 2. S. 163 ff.

[7] Theophili epist. synodalis (rather encyclica) ex vers. Hieronymi from an

court, and the empress Eudoxia. Chrysostom now drew upon himself the bitter hatred of Theophilus, by espousing the cause of the banished monks, and writing to him in their behalf; and this was still more inflamed by a summons which the emperor was induced to send to Theophilus, to appear at Constantinople. After some delay he did appear (A. D. 403), and by his arts succeeded in uniting the enemies of Chrysostom, and, by false charges before the synod (*ad quercum*), bringing him into disgrace and exile. True, it was necessary to recall him in a few days, on account of the popular disturbance, but he was as quickly displaced, principally through the influence of Eudoxia,[8] and died in exile at Pontus in the year 407.[9] Though the Roman bishop, Innocent, condemned these acts of violence, he could not succeed in bringing Theophilus to account;[10] nor was it till some time afterwards, that the innocence of Chrysostom was formally acknowledged at Constantinople.

§ 84.

CONTROVERSIES WITH HERETICS IN THE WEST.

During the Arian controversy, the Manichæans, who, for the most part, conformed externally to the Catholic church, had been silently spreading their doctrines in the West. To this source are to be traced the opinions of *Priscillian*, who appeared in Spain in the year 379.[1]

Ambros. MS. first ed. by Vallarsi (Hier. opp. vol. I. Epist. 92, *Mansi* Conc. coll. T. III. p. 979). The judgment of Postumianus, vid *Sulpic. Sever.* dial. I. c. 6. 7, was more mild. The triumphant language of Jerome is truly disgusting. Ep. ad Theophilum (Martianay ep. 57. Vallarsi ep. 86): Breviter scribimus, quod totus mundus exultet, et in tuis victoriis glorietur, erectumque Alexandriæ vexillum crucis, et adversus hæresin trophæa fulgentia, gaudens populorum turba perspectet. Macte virtute, macte zelo fidei! Ostendisti, quod hucusque taciturnitas dispensatio fuit, non consensus. Libere enim Reverentiæ tuæ loquor. Dolebamus te nimium esse patientem, et ignorantes magistri gubernacula, gestiebamus in interitum perditorum: sed, ut video, exaltasti manum diu, et suspendisti plagam, ut ferires fortius. Jerome translated into Latin all the writings that appeared against the followers of Origen (esp. Theophili libri paschales III. with a catalogue of Origen's heresies. These translations with the correspondence between Jerome and Theophilus in Vallarsi vol. I. Ep. 86. seq.

[8] A sermon of Chrysostom's began thus (Socrat. VI. 18. Sozom. VIII. 20): Πάλιν Ἡρωδιὰς μαίνεται, πάλιν ταράσσεται, πάλιν ὀρχεῖται, πάλιν ἐπὶ πίνακι τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου ζητεῖ λαβεῖν.

[9] Chrysostom's own account of the events in Constantinople *Ep. ad Innocentium I.* A. D. 404 in Palladius, *Ep. ad eundem* from exile, A. D. 407 (both in Constant. Innoc. P. epist. 4 et 11).

[10] Comp. the correspondence between him and Honorius, Mansi Coll. Conc. T. III. p. 1095 seq.

[1] His history Sulpic. Sever. hist. sacr. II. 46–51, who calls his party Gnosticorum hæresis. Something of their doctrine, though an unsatisfactory account, may be found *P. Orosii* consultatio s. commonitorium ad Augustinum de errore Priscillianistarum et Origenistarum, and in the letters *Turibii* Episc. Asturic. written about A. D. 447 (in Opp. Leonis M). Walch's Ketzerhist. Th. 3. S. 378 ff.

His antagonists, the bishops Idacius and Ithacius, after having obtained the condemnation of his doctrines at the synod of Cæsaraugusta (A. D. 380), at length prevailed on the usurper Maximus to put him to death at Triers, in the year 385. This was the first instance of the judicial execution of a heretic, and was universally condemned. Martin, bishop of Turonum, and Ambrose, bishop of Mediolanum,[2] were loud in their expressions of indignation, and the instigators of the deed were finally expelled from their bishopricks. The followers of Priscillian continued to exist, in spite of all persecutions, till after the beginning of the sixth century.

In the mean time the persecution of the hated Manichæans had been renewed. Valentinian, who tolerated every other sect, forbade them the privilege of public worship in the year 372; and the succeeding emperors enacted new and still more rigorous laws against them.[3] Their most zealous adversary, however, was *Aurelius Augustine*, a native of Tagaste in Numidia. Himself formerly a Manichæan, he was converted by Ambrose at Milan, in the year 387, and afterwards, as bishop of Hippo-Regius in Numidia (A. D. 395–430), became the most dreaded opponent of heretics, whilst the influence of his writings on his own and after ages is incalculable.[4] His efforts were particularly directed against the Manichæans.[5] Many were converted by his means, but their numbers were still great. Even at Rome there were already secret Manichæans; though they became much more numerous after the conquest of Africa by the Vandals, in the year 429. Aware of this, Leo the great, bishop of Rome (A. D. 440–461), exerted himself to the utmost to detect and convert them.[6]

---

[2] Martin's conduct in this affair is related by Sulpic. Severus, dial. III. c. 11–13. Ambrosii Ep. 24 and 26. It is true that at the time public opinion condemned the punishment as unallowable.

[3] Lex *Valentiniani I.* A. D. 372 (Cod. Theod. XVI. 5, 3,): Ubicunque Manichæorum conventus, vel turba hujusmodi reperitur, Doctoribus gravi censione multatis, domus et habitacula, in quibus profana institutione docetur, fisci viribus indubitanter adsciscantur. — *Theodosii* M. A. D. 381 (eod. Tit. L. 7.): Manichæis, sub perpetua justæ infamiæ nota, testandi ac vivendi jure Romano omnem protinus eripimus facultatem, neque eos aut relinquendæ aut capiendæ alicujus hæreditatis habere sinimus potestatem, etc. — L. 9. A. D. 382. L. 18. A. D. 389: ex omni quidem orbe terrarum, sed quam maxime de hac urbe pellantur sub interminatione judicii. *Honorii* L. 35. A. D. 399. L. 40. A. D. 407: volumus esse publicum crimen, quia, quod in religionem divinam committitur, in omnium fertur injuriam. Quos bonorum etiam publicatione persequimur, quæ tamen cedere jubemus proximis quibusque personis, etc. L. 43. A. D. 408. — *Theodosii II.* L. 59 and XVI. 10. L. 24. both A. D. 423. XVI. 5, 62. 64. 65.

[4] Besides the numerous writings against heretics, bibl. comm. (cf. *Clausen* Aurel. Augustinus sacræ scripturæ interpres. Hafn. 1826), sermons, ascetic writings, letters, his most remarkable writings are: De civitate Dei libb. XXII. (comp. § 77, note 9). De doctrina christiana libb. IV. Confessiones libb. XIII. (c. præf. A. Neander. Berol. 1823. 8vo.) Retractiones libb. II. *Opp. ed. Monachi Benedictini e Congreg. St. Mauri. Paris.* 1679–1700. XI. voll. *recus. cum Appendice cura Jo. Clerici.* Antverp. 1700–1703. XII. voll. Venetiis. 1729–35. XI. voll. fol. On his life and character, vid. Wiggers Darstellung des Augustinismus und Pelasgianismus (Berlin. 1821), S. 7–33.

[5] His writings against the Manichæans are prefixed to § 59.

[6] Leonis opp. omnia (sermones et epistolæ) ed. *Paschas. Quesnell.* Paris. 1675.

His zeal, backed by the imperial ordinances,[7] was not ineffectual; but still many of the opinions of the Manichæans continued to exist till far into the middle ages.

A still more furious contest was that in Africa in the fourth century, against the Donatists,[8] who, by means of the fanatic Agonistici, (by the Catholics called Circumcelliones *,) openly resisted the imperial laws enacted against them. Augustine appeared as their opponent, and with such an opponent they were little able to cope, even in a better cause. A conference was appointed by the emperor between the two parties, at Carthage (A. D. 411), and the Donatists condemned.[9] By this defeat, and the imperial ordinances that followed,[10] they

---

2 voll. 4to. *Petr. et Hier. fratres Ballerini.* Venetiis. 1755–57. 3 T. fol. — Against the Manichæans *Sermo IV. de Quadragesima*: nemo ambigat esse Manichæos, qui in honorem solis ac lunæ die Dominico et secunda feria deprehensi fuerint jejunare. — Cumque ad tegendum infidelitatem suam nostris audeant interesse mysteriis, ita in sacramentorum communione se temperant, ut interdum tutius lateant: ore indigno Christi corpus accipiunt, sanguinem autem redemtionis nostræ haurire omnino declinant. Quod ideo *Vestram* volumus scire *Sanctitatem*, ut vobis hujuscemodi homines et his manifestentur indiciis, et quorum deprehensa fuerit *sacrilega simulatio*, notati et proditi a sanctorum societate sacerdotali auctoritate pellantur. — *Sermo IV. de Epiphania*, after enumerating the most remarkable of the Manichæan doctrines: Nihil ergo cum hujusmodi hominibus commune sit cuiquam Christiano neminem fallant discretionibus ciborum, sordibus vestium, *vultuumque palloribus* (cf. *Hieron. Epist.* 22 *ad Eustochium*: quam viderint pallentem atque tristem, miseram et Manichæam vocant.) — *Sermo V. de jejunio decimi mensis*: Residentibus itaque mecum Episcopis ac presbyteris ac in eundem consessum Christianis viris ac nobilibus congregatis, Electos et Electas eorum jussimus præsentari. Qui quum de perversitate dogmatis sui, et de festivitatum suarum consuetudine multa reserarent, illud quoque scelus, quod eloqui verecundum est, prodiderunt. Quod tanta diligentia investigatum est, ut nihil minus credulis, nihil obtrectatoribus relinqueretur ambiguum. Aderant enim omnes personæ, per quas infandum facinus fuerat perpetratum, puella scilicet, ut multum decennis, et duæ mulieres, quæ ipsam nutrierant et huic sceleri præpararant. Præsto erat etiam adolescentulus vitiator puellæ, et Episcopus ipsorum detestandi criminis ordinator. Omnium par fuit horum et una confessio, et patefactum est execratum, quod aures nostræ vix ferre potuerunt. De quo ne apertius loquentes castos offendamus auditus, gestorum documenta sufficiunt, quibus plenissime docetur, nullam in hac secta pudicitiam, nullam honestatem, nullam penitus reperiri castitatem, in qua lex est mendacium, diabolus religio, sacrificium turpitudo. — cf. *Leonis* Epist. VIII. ad Episcopos per Italiam. *Epist.* XV. ad Turibium.

[7] Valentiniani III. Novella II. A. D. 445.

[8] For references see above, § 69, note 19.

* Concerning the time of their origin see Optatus III. c. 4. Described by Augustine de hæres lib. c. 69. Idem contra Gaudentium, I. § 32. Ejusdem Enarratio in Psalm. 132, § 3.

[9] Gesta collationis Carthagine habitæ prim. ed. *Papirius Masson.* Paris. 1589. 8vo. according to the emended ed. of Baluzius in *du Pin* monim. ad hist. Donatist. p. 225, and *Mansi* coll. Concil. T. IV. p. 1. — *Augustini* breviculus collationis cum Donatistis (opp. T. IX. p. 371.)

[10] In the year 412, after several other laws against them, Honorius ordered (*Cod. Theod.* XVI. 5, 52.) a general fine to be exacted of them. Also: Servos etiam dominorum admonitio, vel colonos verberum crebrior ictus a prava religione revocabit. — Clerici vero ministrique eorum ac perniciosissimi sacerdotales ablati de Africano solo, quod ritu sacrilego polluerunt, in exilium viritim ad singulas quasque regiones sub idonea prosecutione mittantur, ecclesiis eorum vel

were much weakened, though remnants of the party are found as late as the seventh century.

§ 85.

PELAGIAN CONTROVERSY.

G. J. Vossii hist. de controversiis, quas Pelagius ejusque reliquiæ moverunt, libb. VII. Lugd. Bat. 1618. 4to. auct. ed. *G. Voss.* Amst. 1655. 4to. (recus. in *Vossii opp.* T. VI.). — *Henr. Norisii* historia Pelagiana et dissert. de Synodo V. œcumenica. Patavii. 1673. fol. (recus. in *Norisii opp.* T. I. Veron. 1729). — *Joh. Garnier* diss. VII, quibus integra continetur Pelagianorum historia (in his edition of Marii Mercatoris opp. T. I. p. 113). — *Præfatio* in Tom. X. opp. Augustini edit. Monach. Benedict. — Walch's Ketzerhistorie, Th. 4. S. 519 ff. Wundemann's Gesch. d. christl. Glaubenslehren, Th. 2. S. 42 ff. — Münscher's Dogmengesch. Bd. 4. S. 170. — G. F. Wiggers' pragmat. Darstellung des Augustinismus u. Pelagianismus. Berl. 1821. 8vo. [Bibl. Repository, Andover, for Jan. 1833. — Tr.]

The most important change made by Augustine in the doctrines of the church, regarded the relation of the Divine grace to the human will; his views on which subject were developed in the course of the Pelagian controversy. The freedom of the will, the evil consequences of the fall, and the necessity of divine grace had always been admitted in the church, without any attempt to define these points in set formulas.[1] Since the time of Tertullian, an opinion had been common in the Latin church, which was as yet wholly unknown in the Greek; that the sin of Adam was entailed upon all his posterity, (traducx animæ, tradux peccati): and that this is the cause of their sinfulness. Such an opinion must, of course, have some influence on the views of free will and the Divine grace. *Pelagius* and *Celestius*, two monks universally esteemed for their virtues, were very zealous in teaching the doctrine of free will, in order thus to animate men to virtuous effort. This they began at Rome in the year 409, and afterwards went to Africa (A. D. 411), whence Pelagius passed over into Palestine. Celestius remained in Carthage, and having become a candidate for the office of presbyter in that city, was accused of vari-

---

conventiculis prædiisque, si qua in eorum ecclesias hæreticorum largitas prava contulit, proprietati potestatique Catholicæ (sicut jam dudum statuimus) vindicatis. Besides all this, (A. D. 414,) L. 54: Evidenti præceptione se agnoscan et intestabiles, et nullam potestatem alicujus ineundi habere, sed perpetua inustos infamia, cœtibus honestis et a conventu publico segregandos.

[1] *Horn* Comm. de sententiis eorum patrum, quorum auctoritas ante Augustinum plurimum valuit, de peccato originali. Gœtting. 1801. 4to. Wiggers, l. c. S. 403 ff. With how little justice Augustine appealed in support of his theory to Gregory Nazianzen, is shown by Ullmann, Gregor v. Naz. S. 438 ff. 446 ff.

ous errors,[2] and shut out from the church-communion at a synod held in Carthage in the year 412; whereupon he betook himself to Ephesus.

The doctrines of Celestius had gained many friends, however, whence Augustine, who had taken no part in his condemnation, was induced to oppose them. In the course of this controversy he was led to notice the writings of Pelagius, as the teacher of Celestius, though as yet with respect and forbearance.[3] But Jerome, who had been embittered against Pelagius, by some trifling cause, having intimated that he was a secret follower of Origen,[4] and the presbyter Orosius,[5] whom

---

[2] Marius Mercator has preserved from the *gestis Concilii* the seven points of accusation (commonitorium I. ed. Baluz. p. 3. comm. II. p. 133): I. Adam mortalem factum, qui sive peccaret, sive non peccaret, fuisset moriturus. II. Quoniam peccatum Adæ ipsum solum læset, et non genus humanum. III. Quoniam infantes, qui nascuntur, in eo statu sunt, in quo Adam fuit ante prævaricationem. IV. Quoniam neque per mortem vel prævaricationem Adæ omne genus hominum moriatur, neque per resurrectionem Christi omne hominum genus resurgat. V. Quoniam infantes, etiamsi non baptizentur, habeant vitam æternam. VI. Quoniam lex sic mittit ad regnum cœlorum, quomodo et evangelium. VII. Quoniam et ante adventum Domini fuerunt homines impeccabiles, id est sine peccato (p. 3: Posse esse hominem sine peccato et facile Dei mandata servare, quia et ante Christi adventum fuerunt homines sine peccato). cf. *Augustin.* de gestis Pelagii 11. Celestius' defence of the second and third points in *Augustin.* de pecc. orig. c. 3. 4. (from the Acts of the Synod): Dixi, de traduce peccati dubium me esse, ita tamen, ut cui donavit Deus gratiam peritiæ, consentiam; quia diversa ab eis audivi, qui utique in ecclesia catholica constituti sunt presbyteri. — Sanctus presbyter Rufinus (probably the celebrated Rufinus, vid. *Norisius hist. Pelag.* I. 2, and *de Syn. quint. c.* 13) Romæ qui mansit cum sancto Pammachio: ego audivi illum dicentem, quia tradux peccati non sit. — Licet quæstionis res sit ista, non hæresis. Infantes semper dixi egere baptizari: quid quærit aliud?

[3] The writings of Augustine on this subject till A. D. 415, *Sermones* 170, 174, 175, 293, 294; *Epist.* 140 ad Honoratum; 157 ad Hilarium (in reply to his information of Sicilian Pelagians in epist. 156); especially *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* (s. de baptismo parvulorum) libb. III. *ad Marcellinum* (in lib. 3. against the expositions of the epistles of Paul); and *De spiritu et littera ad eundem.* These were all writtten A. D. 412–414. — *De natura et gratia* against Pelagii lib. de natura (Ep. 169. § 13. adversus Pelagii *hæresim*), and *De perfectione justitiæ hominis* epist. s. liber *ad Eutropium et Paullum* against Cælestii definitiones, both A. D. 415.

[4] *Hieron. præf. libri* I. in Jeremiam: Nuper indoctus calumniator erupit, qui commentarios meos in epistolam Pauli ad Ephesios reprehendendos putat (cf. *Augustin.* contra Julianum Pelagian. II.-36: De illo sancto presbytero (Hieronymo) -- non solet Pelagius jactitare, *nisi quod ei tamquam æmulo inviderit). Præf. lib. IV. in Jerem.*: subito hæresis Pythagoræ et Zenonis ἀπαθείας καὶ ἀναμαρτησίας id est impassibilitatis et impeccantiæ, quæ olim in Origene, et dudum in discipulis ejus, Grunnio, Evagrioque Pontico, et Joviniano jugulata est, cœpit reviviscere, et non solum in Occidentis, sed in Orientis partibus sibilare. — Jerome against Pelagius *Epist. ad Ctesiphontem* (Martianay ep. 43, Vallarsi ep. 133), and the *dialogi contra Pelagianos* libb. III. in A. D. 414 and 415. — The dialogues were answered by *Theodorus Mopsvestenus πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας φύσει καὶ οὐ γνώμῃ, πταίειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους* libb. V. cf. *Photius* cod. 177, and *Ebedjesu* in *Assemani bibl. Or.* T. III. P. I. p. 34. Many fragments are preserved in Latin by Marius Mercator ed. Baluz. p. 339 seq.

[5] *August.* epist. 169. § 13: Scripsi etiam librum ad sanctum presbyterum Hieronymum *de animæ origine* (ep. 166), consulens eum, quomodo defendi possit illa sententia, quam religiosæ memoriæ Marcellino suam esse scripsit, singulas animas novas nascentibus fieri, ut non labefactetur fundatissima ecclesiæ fides, qua inconcusse credimus, quod in Adam omnes moriuntur, et nisi per Christum

Augustine had sent out for the purpose, having failed in his attempt to obtain the condemnation of the Pelagian doctrines, first with the bishop of Jerusalem,[6] and then with a synod at Diospolis (Lydda, A. D. 415), Augustine laid aside his forbearance, and commenced in earnest the contest with this new heresy.[7] The African bishops condemned the doctrines of Pelagius at the synod of Mileve and Carthage (A. D. 416),[8] and their decision received the full approbation of Innocent, bishop of Rome.[9] After the death of Innocent, in the year 417, Pelagius and Cælestius were declared orthodox by his successor, Zosimus.[10] But the African church adhered to their first decision, at a synod held at Carthage in the year 417,[11] and also at a general synod in the same city, in the following year,[12] and succeeded in obtaining from Honorius a *sacrum rescriptum* against the Pelagians.[13] After this, Zosimus also yielded, and condemned the Pela-

---

liberentur, quod per suum Sacramentum etiam in parvulis operatur, in condemnationem trahuntur. — Occasionem quippe cujusdam sanctissimi et studiosissimi juvenis presbyteri Orosii, qui ad nos ab ultima Hispania, id est ab Oceani littore, solo sanctarum scripturarum ardore inflammatus advenit, amittere nolui, cui, ut ad illum quoque pergeret, persuasi.

[6] See the history of this in *Orosii* apologeticus contra Pelagium de arbitrii libertate.

[7] A. D. 416: *De gestis Pelagii s. de gestis Palæstinis* (also the chief authority on the history of the Synod of Diospolis). — 418: *Contra Pelagium et Cælestium* libb. II, I. *de gratia Christi*, II. *de peccato originali*, a standard authority. — 419: *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* libb. II. *De anima ejusque origine.* — 420: *Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum* libb. IV. *ad Bonifacium Rom. eccl. Episcopum.* — 421: *Contra Julianum hær. Pelagianæ defensorem* libb. VI. — 426. 427. (comp. note 32), *De gratia et libero arbitrio* ad Monachos Adrumetinos. *De correptione et gratia* ad eosdem (in which the doctrine of predestination is the most distinctly taught). — 427–430: *Contra secundam Juliani responsionem imperfectum opus*, libb. VI.

[8] The letter of the Synod to Innocent I. from Carthage, in Epist. Augustini Ep. 175, from Mileve Ep. 176. Both also in Coustant.

[9] His answer to Carthage August. Epist. 181, according to Mileve Ep. 182, and in Coustant.

[10] (See especially Cælestii symb. ad Zosim. below, note 16). The three letters of Zosimus ad *Aurelium et cæteros Episc. Afric.*, the first two of Sept. 417, the third of 2d March, 418, in Coustant. In the first we read: Ipsum sane Cælestium, et quicunque in tempore ex diversis regionibus aderant sacerdotes, admonui, has tendiculas quæstionum et inepta certamina, quæ non ædificant, sed magis destruunt, ex illa curiositatis contagione profluere; dum unusquisque ingenio suo et intemperanti eloquentia supra scripta (i. e. Scripturam S.) abutitur, etc.

[11] Fragment of the letter of the Synod to Zosimus in *Prosperi L. contra collatorem* c. 15: Constituimus, in Pelagium atque Cælestium per venerabilem episcopum Innocentium de beatissimi apostoli Petri sede prolatam manere sententiam, donec apertissima confessione fateantur, gratia Dei per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum, non solum ad cognoscendam, verum etiam ad faciendam justitiam, nos per actus singulos adjuvari, etc.

[12] Mansi T. IV. p. 377. The eight (or nine, see Norisius l. c. p. 135, the Benedictines, præf. in T. X. opp. Aug. § 18 and App. T. X. p. 71,) canons against the Pelagians are, in the collection of decrees of councils, put erroneously as the first of the Synod of Mileve A. D. 416, *Mansi* IV. p. 325 seq.

[13] Vid. *Opp. August.* ed. *Benedict.* T. X. Appendicis Pars II. continens varia scripta et monumenta ad Pelagianorum historiam pertinentium p. 105 (ed. Venet.). The *Edictum* of the three Præf. Prætorio consequent thereon, p. 106.

gian doctrines in his *Epistola tractoria.*[14] This the Italian bishops were compelled to subscribe, and eighteen, who refused to do so, were deprived of their places. Amongst them was Julian, bishop of Eclanum, who continued to defend the Pelagian doctrines, and was especially answered by Augustine.

The Pelagians did not form a peculiar church, but only a peculiar party, and thus had no system of faith, but differed from each other in particular points. Their opinions, as gathered from their own writings,[15] where alone they are fairly represented, may be reduced to the following articles:

"There is no original sin.[16] Man can, by his free will, choose

---

[14] Fragments of the work App. p. 108 and in Coustant. That Baronius, Norisius, Garnier, and others are mistaken in asserting that the *tractoria* was issued before the African council and the *Sacrum rescriptum*, is shown by *Tillemont* T. XIII. p. 738, 739, and the Benedictines, præf. ad T. X. opp. Aug. § 18. — Hence *August. contra duas epist Pelag.* II. c. 3: Quin etiam "(Pelagiani) Romanos clericos arguunt, scribentes, eos jussionis terrore perculsos non erubuisse prævaricationis crimen admittere, ut contra priorem sententiam suam, qua gestis catholico dogmati adfuerant, postea pronuntiarent, malam hominum esse naturam."

[15] The works of Pelagius have been accidentally preserved in the works of Jerome, namely: *Pelagii expositiones in epist. Pauli.* written before A. D. 410, (that Pelagius is the author, G. J. Vossius hist. Pelag. I. 4. Cassiodorus has probably done nothing but to emend the comm. on the ep. to the Romans. Comp. Rosenmüller hist. Interpret. P. III. p. 505 seq.) — *Epistola ad Demetriadem*, A. D. 413 (cum aliis aliorum epistolis ed. *J. S. Semler.* Hal. 1775. 8vo. cf. Rosenmüller l. c. p. 522 seq.). — *Libellus fidei ad Innocent. I.* A. D. 417 (in the Libros Carolinos de imag. cultu III. c. 1. adopted as confessio fidei, quam a SS. Patribus accepimus, tenemus et puro corde credimus, as late as A. D. 1521, cited by the Sorbonne in their Articulis against Luther as sermo Augustini, often called, erroneously, Hieronymi Symboli explan. ad Damasum. cf. J. Launojus de auctore vero professionis fidei, quæ Pelagio, Hieronymo, Augustino tribui vulgo solet diss. Paris. ed. 2. 1663. 8vo. Walchii bibl. symb. vetus p. 192 seq.). — Of *Pelagii lib. de natura* Fragm. August. de nat. et gratia. Of the libb. IV. *de libero arbitrio*, and the *Epist. ad Innocent.* I. Fragm. in August. de gratia Christi and de peccato originali. *Capitula s. eclogæ* Fragm. in Hieron. dial. 1. contra Pelagianos and in August. de gestis Pelagii. — *Cælestii definitiones* Fragm. in August. de perfect. justit. *Symbolum ad Zosimum* Fragm. in August. de peccato origin. cf. Walchii bibl. symb. vetus p. 198 seq.). — *Juliani* libb. IV. *ad Turbantium Episc. contra Augustini primum de Nuptiis*, Fragm in August. contra Julianum, and in M. Mercatoris Subnotationes. *Libb.* VIII. *ad Florum contra Augustini secundum de nuptiis*, Fragm. in Aug. opus imperfect. and in Marius Mercator, l. c. — A Pelagian confession of faith, by Garnier, called, erroneously, *Symb. Juliani*, vid. Walch. bibl. symb. vet. p. 199 seq.

[16] *Cælestii Symb. fragm.* I.: Infantes autem debere baptizari in remissionem peccatorum secundum regulam universalis ecclesiæ et secundum evangelii sententiam, confitemur, quia Dominus statuit, regnum cælorum nonnisi baptizatis posse conferri: quod quia vires naturæ non habent, conferri necesse est per gratiæ libertatem. In remissionem autem peccatorum baptizandos infantes non idcirco diximus, ut *peccatum ex traduce* (or *peccatum naturæ*, *peccatum naturale*), firmare videamur, quod longe a catholico sensu alienum est. Quia peccatum non cum homine nascitur, quod postmodum exercetur ab homine: quia non naturæ delictum, sed voluntatis esse demonstratur. Et illud ergo confiteri congruum, ne diversa baptismatis genera facere videamur, et hoc præmunire necessarium est, ne per mysterii occasionem, ad creatoris injuriam, malum, antequam fiat ab homine, tradi dicatur homini per naturam. *Pelagii ep. ad Demetr.* c. 4:

good as well as evil.[17] Every one, therefore, can secure future happiness, (*salus*, or *vita æterna.*) A still higher happiness (*regnum cœlorum*) is offered to men by Christianity, to which baptism is a necessary condition.[18] As the law was formerly given to men to guide and assist them in the way of goodness, so now the instructions and example of Christ, and the particular operations of God's grace. These last, however, are always preceded by the free resolve to be virtuous.[19] God's predestination, therefore, is grounded entirely on his foreknowledge of human actions."

Though Augustine had formerly, in his controversy with the Manichæans, conceded much to the freedom of the will, and taken a very different view of predestination,[20] he had long since adopted a stricter

---

Ferat sententiam de naturæ bono ipsa conscientia bona. — — Quid illud obsecro est, quod ad omne peccatum aut erubescimus, aut timemus? et culpam facti nunc rubore vultus, nunc pallore monstramus? — e diverso autem in omni bono læti, constantes, intrepidi sumus? — Est enim inquam in animis nostris naturalis quædam (ut ita dixerim) sanctitas, quæ velut in arce animi præsidens exercet boni malique judicium. Comp however, c. 8: Neque vero alia nobis causa difficultatem bene faciendi facit, quam longa consuetudo vitiorum, quæ nos infecit a parvo, paulatimque per multos corrupit annos, et ita postea obligatos sibi et addictos tenet, ut vim quodammodo videatur habere naturæ.

[17] *Pelagius* ap. August. de pecc. orig. 14: Omne bonum ac malum, quo vel laudabiles vel vituperabiles sumus, non nobiscum oritur, sed agitur a nobis: capaces enim utriusque rei, non pleni nascimur, et ut sine virtute, ita et sine vitio procreamur: atque ante actionem propriæ voluntatis, id solum in homine est, quod Deus condidit. *Epist. ad Demetr.* c. 3: Volens namque Deus rationabilem creaturam voluntarii boni munere et liberi arbitrii potestate donare, utriusque partis possibilitatem homini inserendo proprium ejus fecit, esse quod velit: ut boni ac mali capax, naturaliter utrumque posset, et ad alterutrum voluntatem deflecteret. — Hence *Cælestii definitiones* arguments, hominem sine peccato esse posse. e. g. *def* 2: Iterum quærendum est, peccatum voluntatis an necessitatis est? Si necessitatis est, peccatum non est, si voluntatis, vitari potest.

[18] *August de Pecc. merit. et remiss.* I., 30: Sed quia non ait, inquiunt, "Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et spiritu, non habebit salutem vel vitam æternam," tantummodo autem dixit "non intrabit in regnum Dei" (Jo. iii. 5): ad hoc parvuli baptizandi sunt, ut sint etiam cum Christo in regno Dei, ubi non erunt, si baptizati non fuerint: quamvis et sine baptismo si parvuli moriantur, salutem vitamque æternam habituri sint, quoniam nullo peccati vinculo obstricti sunt.

[19] *Pelagius de libero arbitrio* (ap. Aug. de grat. Chr. 7): Hic nos imperitissimi hominum putant injuriam divinæ gratiæ facere, quia dicimus eam sine voluntate nostra nequaquam in nobis perficere sanctitatem: quasi Deus gratiæ suæ aliquid imperaverit, et non illis, quibus imperavit, etiam gratiæ suæ auxilium subministret, ut quod per liberum homines facere jubentur arbitrium, facilius possent implere per gratiam. Quam nos non, ut tu putas, in lege tantummodo, sed et in Dei esse adjutorio confitemur. Adjuvat enim nos Deus per doctrinam et revelationem suam, dum cordis nostri oculos aperit; dum nobis, ne præsentibus occupemur, futura demonstrat; dum diaboli pandit insidias; dum nos multiformi et ineffabili dono gratiæ cælestis illuminat. *Ejusdem Ep. ad Innoc.* (ibid. c. 31): Ecce apud beatitudinem tuam epistola ista me purget, in qua pure atque simpliciter ad peccandum et ad non peccandum integrum liberum arbitrium habere nos dicimus, quod in omnibus bonis operibus divino adjuvatur semper auxilio. Quam liberi arbitrii potestatem dicimus in omnibus esse generaliter, in Christianis, Judæis, atque Gentilibus. In omnibus est liberum arbitrium æqualiter per naturam, sed in solis Christianis juvatur a gratia.

[20] *August. de prædest. Sanct.* c. 3: Quo præcipue testimonio (1 Cor. iv. 7), etiam ipse convictus sum, cum similiter errarem, putans fidem, qua in Deum

system,[21] which was now first fully developed, as follows:[22] "By the sin of Adam human nature became physically and morally corrupt; his sin, of itself damnatory, (*peccatum originale*,) has descended to all men,[23] and they have thus no longer a free will, except to choose evil. From this corrupt mass (*perditionis massa*) God resolved from all eternity to save some through Christ, and consign the rest to the perdition they all had deserved. Though baptism gives forgiveness of sins, and even of original sin, it does not remedy the

---

credimus, non esse donum Dei, sed a nobis esse in nobis, et per illam nos impetrare Dei dona, quibus temperanter et juste et pie vivamus in hoc sæculo. Neque enim fidem putabam Dei gratia præveniri, ut per illam nobis daretur, quod posceremus utiliter, nisi quia credere non possemus, si non præcederet præconium veritatis: ut autem prædicato nobis Evangelio consentiremus, nostrum esse proprium, et nobis ex nobis esse arbitrabar. Quem meum errorem nonnulla opuscula mea satis indicant ante episcopatum meum scripta (see especially the *Expositio quarundam propositionum in Ep. ad Rom. c.* 60 and 61. Other passages from the writings against heretics are cited by Wundemann, Th. 2. S. 79, 91). cf. *Retractt. I.* 23.

[21] Comp. *Lib. de diversis quæstionibus* 83, (written A. D. 388–395,) *Qu.* LXVIII. § 4–6. *De diversis quæstionibus ad Simplicianum, L. I. Qu.* 2 (A. D. 397). Münscher's Dogmengesch. Bd. 4. S. 209.

[22] Comp. Wiggers, S. 264 ff. *Cornelius Mussus Episc. Bitontinus* (+ 1574) *comm. in Epist. ad Rom. c.* 5. *p.* 270, already accuses Augustine: Hoc est enim illi peculiare, ut cum aliquem expugnat errorem, tanta vehementia illum exaggeret, ut alteri errori opposito ansam præbere videatur. Ita cum Arium insectatur, videtur favere Sabellio; cum Sabellium, Ario; cum Pelagium, Manichæis; cum Manichæos, Pelagio. cf. *Jo. Fabricii diss. de Scylla Theologica* in *Ejusd. amœnitatibus theoll.* c. 9. Norisius, on the other hand, sought to defend him in the *Vindiciis Augustinianis* c. 5. § 5. — The system of Augustine is very differently represented to suit the views of different parties; most correctly by the Reformed Dominicans, Augustins, and Jansenists: most misrepresented by the Jesuits.

[23] Comp. especially the books: *De peccato originali* and *De nuptiis et concupiscentia.* — *De civ. Dei* 14, 1: A primis hominibus admissum est tam grande peccatum, ut in deterius eo natura mutaretur humana, etiam in posteros obligatione peccati et mortis necessitate transmissa. *De peccat. merit. et remiss. I.* 9: Ille, in quo omnes moriuntur, præter quod eis qui præceptum Domini voluntate transgrediuntur, imitationis exemplum est, occulta etiam tabe carnalis concupiscentiæ suæ tabificavit in se omnes de sua stirpe venientes. *De corrept. et gratia* 10. Quia vero (Adam) per liberum arbitrium Deum deseruit, justum judicium Dei expertus est, ut cum tota sua stirpe, quæ in illo adhuc posita tota cum illo peccaverat, damnaretur (*de Peccat. merit. et remiss. I.* 10. the passage Rom. v. 12. In quo omnes peccaverunt ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον is cited with the remark, quando omnes ille unus homo fuerunt). Quotquot enim ex hac stirpe gratia Dei liberantur, a damnatione utique liberantur, qua jam tenentur obstricti. Unde etiam si nullus liberaretur, justum Dei judicium nemo juste reprehenderet. Quod ergo pauci in comparatione pereuntium, in suo vero numero multi liberantur, gratia fit, gratis fit, gratiæ sunt agendæ, quia fit, ne quis velut de suis meritis extollatur, sed omne os obstruatur, et qui gloriatur, in Domino glorietur. *De pecc. orig.* 31: Unde ergo recte infans illa perditione punitur, nisi quia pertinet ad massam perditionis, et juste intelligitur ex Adam natus, antiqui debiti obligatione damnatus, nisi inde fuerit, non secundum debitum, sed secundum gratiam liberatus? — Hence the Pelagians accuse him of teaching a tradux animæ and tradux peccati (*Traduciani*). On the other hand, *Aug. opus imp.* IV. 104: Argue de origine animarum cunctationem meam, quia non audeo docere vel affirmare quod nescio (cf. *de peccat. merit. et remiss.* II. 36).

moral corruption of men.[24] Therefore, in the elect, the grace of God of itself and irresistibly inspires not only faith, but the wish and the power to do right.[25] Those, who do not partake in the grace of God,[26] have no part in Christ, and are devoted to damnation,[27] and that eternal.[28]

---

[24] *De nupt. et concupisc. I.* 26: In eis ergo qui regenerantur in Christo, cum remissionem accipiunt prorsus omnium peccatorum, utique necesse est, ut reatus etiam hujus licet adhuc manentis concupiscentiæ remittatur, ut in peccatum, sicut dixi, non imputetur. — manet actu, præterit reatu. *De peccat. meritis et remiss.* I. 19: Cæterum quis ignorat, quod baptizatus parvulus, si ad rationales annos veniens non crediderit, nec se ab illicitis concupiscentiis abstinuerit, nihil ei proderit, quod parvus accepit? Verumtamen si percepto baptismate de hac vita emigraverit, soluto reatu, cui originaliter erat obnoxius, perficietur in illo lumine veritatis, quod incommutabiliter manens in æternum, justificatos præsentia creatoris illuminat.

[25] *De correpl. et grat.* 7: Quicunque ergo ab illa originali damnatione ista divinæ gratiæ largitate discreti sunt, non est dubium, quod et procuratur eis audiendum evangelium; et cum audiunt, credunt; et in fide, quæ per dilectionem operatur, usque in finem perseverant; et si quando exorbitant, correpti emendantur, et quidam eorum, etsi ab hominibus non corripiantur, in viam quam reliquerant redeunt; et nonnulli accepta gratia, in qualibet ætate, periculis hujus vitæ mortis celeritate subtrahuntur. Hæc enim omnia operatur in eis, qui vasa misericordiæ operatus est eos, qui et elegit eos in filio suo ante constitutionem mundi per electionem gratiæ. *De gratia Christi* c. 24: Non lege atque doctrina insonante forinsecus, sed interna atque occulta mirabili ac ineffabili potestate operari Deum in cordibus hominum non solum veras revelationes, sed etiam bonas voluntates. *De correpl. et grat. c.* 9: Quicunque ergo in Dei providentissima dispositione præsciti, prædestinati, vocati, justificati, glorificati sunt, non dico etiam nondum renati, sed etiam nondum nati, jam filii Dei sunt, et omnino perire non possunt. *Ibid.* 12: Ac per hoc nec de ipsa perseverantia boni voluit Deus sanctos suos in viribus suis, sed in ipso gloriari. — Tantum quippe Spiritu sancto accenditur voluntas eorum, ut ideo possint, quia sic volunt; ideo sic velint, quia Deus operatur, ut velint. — Subventum est igitur infirmitati voluntatis humanæ, ut divina gratia indeclinabiliter et insuperabiliter ageretur. *Ibid.* 14: Non est itaque dubitandum, voluntati Dei, qui in cælo et in terra omnia, quæcunque voluit, fecit, et qui etiam illa, quæ futura sunt, fecit, humanas voluntates non posse resistere, quo minus faciat ipse quod vult: quandoquidem etiam de ipsis hominum voluntatibus, quod vult, cum vult, facit. These moral effects of grace, Augustine comprehends under *Justificatio.* cf. *Opus imperfect. contra Jul.* II. c. 168: Justificat impium Deus, non solum dimittendo, quæ mala facit, sed etiam donando caritatem, quæ declinat a malo et facit bonum per Spiritum sanctum.

[26] For the most part Augustine uses the expression *Prædestinatio*, only of the predestination to happiness; sometimes, also, to condemnation. *Tract.* 110 *in Joan.* distinguishes duplicem mundum, unum damnationi prædestinatum, alterum ex inimico amicum factum et reconciliatum. *Enchirid. ad Laur.* c. 100: Hæc sunt magna opera Domini, ut cum angelica et humana creatura peccasset, — etiam per eandem creaturæ voluntatem, qua factum est quod Creator noluit, impleret ipse quod voluit: bene utens et malis, tamquam summe bonus, ad eorum damnationem, quos juste prædestinavit ad pœnam, et ad eorum salutem, quos benigne prædestinavit ad gratiam. cf. *De grat. et lib. arbitr.* c. 21: operari Deum in cordibus hominum ad inclinandas eorum voluntates quocunque voluerit, sive ad bona pro sua misercordia, sive ad mala pro meritis eorum. *Ratramnus de prædest. lib. secundo* (in *Maugnin's* collection), has collected several passages of this kind. Comp. however, Wiggers, S. 305. ff.

[27] *De peccat. merit. et remiss.* III. 4: Quoniam nihil agitur aliud, cum parvuli baptizantur, nisi ut incorporentur ecclesiæ, id est, Christi corpori membrisque socientur, manifestum est, eos ad damnationem, nisi hoc eis collatum fuerit, pertinere. *De gratia et lib. arbitr.* 3: Sed et illa ignorantia, quæ non est eorum, qui

These doctrines having been approved by the African synods, as well as by Zosimus, became the established faith of the Western church, but were never adopted by the Greek church, which, from the first, had taken but little interest in this controversy.[29] The exiled bishops, therefore, went from the West to the East, and sought the imperial protection at Constantinople; afterwards, more particularly under the patronage of the bishop, Nestor. But they found here an active adversary in Marius Mercator,[30] and at the third general council held at Ephesus (A. D. 431), the Pelagians were formally condemned. It must be remembered, however, that Pelagianism, as here condemned, was confounded with notions peculiar to individuals of the party, and with consequences which the Pelagians themselves

---

scire nolunt, sed eorum, qui tanquam simpliciter nesciunt, neminem sic excusat, ut sempiterno igne non ardeat, si propterea non credidit, quia non audivit omnino quid crederet; sed fortasse, ut mitius ardeat (cf. *contra Julianum* IV. 3. Absit, ut sit in aliquo vera virtus, nisi fuerit justus. Absit autem, ut sit justus vere, nisi vivat ex fide. Minus enim Fabricius quam Catilina punietur, non quia iste bonus, sed quia ille magis malus: et minus impius, quam Catilina, Fabricius, non veras virtutes habendo, sed a veris virtutibus non plurimum deviando). — *De correpl. et grat.* 7: Ac per hoc et qui Evangelium non audierunt, et qui eo audito in melius commutati perseverantiam non acceperunt, et qui Evangelio audito venire ad Christum, hoc est, in eum credere noluerunt, quoniam ipse dixit, *Nemo venit ad me, nisi ei datum fuerit a Patre meo*, (Jo. vi. 65,) et qui per ætatem parvulam nec credere potuerunt, sed ab originali noxa solo possent lavacro regenerationis absolvi, quo tamen non accepto mortui perierunt; non sunt ab illa conspersione discreti, quam constat esse damnatam, euntibus omnibus ex uno in condemnationem. *Ibid.* 13: Propter hujus ergo utilitatem secreti credendum est, quosdam de filiis perditionis non accepto dono perseverandi usque in finem, in fide, quæ per dilectionem operatur, incipere vivere, et aliquamdiu fideliter ac juste vivere, et postea cadere, neque de hac vita, priusquam hoc eis contingat, auferri. *De prædest. Sanct.* 8: Cur autem istum potius, quam illum liberet, *inscrutabilia sunt judicia ejus et investigabiles viæ ejus* (Rom. xi. 33). Melius enim et hic audimus aut dicimus: *O homo, tu quis es, qui respondeas Deo* (Rom. ix. 20). How much perplexity the passage 1 Tim. ii. 4, *qui omnes vult homines salvos fieri*, occasioned Augustine, is evident from his numerous, and all very forced attempts to explain it. So *De correpl. et grat. c.* 14. *Contra Jul.* IV. *c.* 8. Omnes i. q. multos. *Enchirid. ad Laur.* 103. Omnes i. q. omnis generis. *De correpl. et gratia c.* 15: Omnes homines Deus vult salvos fieri, quoniam nos facit velle. *Enchirid l. c.* tanquam diceretur, nullum hominem fieri salvum, nisi quem fieri salvum ipse voluerit.

[28] *De civ. Dei* XXI. *c.* 23. *Enchirid. ad Laur.* c. 112. (See above, § 82, note 30). The last passage is against those who argued from Ps. lxxvi. 10, that the punishment of hell will have an end. Still he allowed: Sed pœnas damnatorum certis temporum intervallis existiment, si hoc eis placet, aliquatenis mitigari. Etiam sic quippe intelligi potest manere in illis ira Dei (according to Joh. iii. 36), h. e. ipsa damnatio, — ut in ira sua, h. e. manente ira sua, non tamen contineat miserationes suas; non æterno supplicio finem dando, sed levamen adhibendo vel interponendo cruciatibus. In the *Enarrat. in Psalm.* cv. however, § 2, he declares even this hypothesis too bold.

[29] Münschers Dogmengesch. Bd. 4, S. 238 ff. — Silence of the Greek church-historians concerning the Pelagian controversy.

[30] Opera ed. *Jo. Garnerius.* Paris. 1673. fol. Better *Steph. Baluzius.* Par. 1684. 8vo. (printed again in *Gallandii* Bibl. vett. Patr. T. VIII. p. 613 seq.) — Pars I. against the Pelagians, Commonitorium adv. hæresin Pelag. et Cælest. vel etiam scripta Juliani, and Commonitorium super nomen Cælestii (429 presented to Theodosius II.)

did not allow;[31] and, also, that the Pelagians, having sought Nestor's protection, were considered as his adherents, — in itself a sufficient reason for their condemnation.[32]

Although Augustine's doctrine of free grace had been adopted as the faith of the Western church, but few held to it in all its strictness. Its injurious practical consequences could not be overlooked, and were occasionally exemplified;[33] and the monks, especially, were altogether opposed to a doctrine which took away all the merit of their monastic practices. Thus Augustine soon found his doctrine disputed even by Anti-Pelagians.[34] The monks in Massilia, particularly, adopted a view of free grace between that of Augustine and that of Pelagius, which seems to have originated chiefly with *John Cassian*, (+ soon after the year 432,)[35] a pupil of Chrysostom.[36] Augustine

---

[31] e. g. *August. de pecc. mer. et rem.* II. 2: Sunt quidam tantum præsumentes de libero humanæ voluntatis arbitrio, ut ad non peccandum nec adjuvandos nos divinitus opinentur. c. 5: Dicunt, accepto semel liberæ voluntatis arbitrio nec orare nos debere, ut Deus nos adjuvet, ne peccemus. — *Epistola conc. Carthag. ad Innocent.* (Aug. epist. 175) § 2: Id enim agunt, — ut non defendendo sed potius in superbiam sacrilegam extollendo liberum arbitrium, nullum relinquant locum gratiæ Dei, qua Christiani sumus. — Isti autem asserunt, — in eo Dei gratiam deputandam, quod talem hominis instituit creavitque naturam, quæ per propriam voluntatem legem Dei possit implere. — Eandem quoque legem ad gratiam Dei pertinere, quod illam Deus in adjutorium hominibus dedit. § 6: Parvulos etiam propter salutem, quæ per salvatorem Christum datur, baptizandos negant, ac sic eos mortifera ista doctrina in æternum necant, promittentes, etiamsi non baptizentur, habituros vitam æternam. *Marius Mercator*, in his commentaries, gives especial weight to the tenets of Cælestius, whereas Pelagius had rejected most of them at the Synod of Diospolis.

[32] See below, § 86, notes 10 and 16.

[33] Comp. the remarkable controversy amongst the monks of Adrumetum, A. D. 426 and 427. *August. Epistt.* 214–216. *Retract.* II. 66, 67. Some (*Ep.* 214) sic gratiam prædicant, ut negent hominis esse liberum arbitrium, et quod est gravius dicant, quod in die judicii non sit redditurus Deus unicuique secundum opera ejus. They asserted, therefore, (*Retr.* II. 67), neminem corripiendum, si Dei præcepta non facit, sed pro illo ut faciat, tantummodo orandum. (Different, after all, only in the form, not essentially, from the doctrines of Augustine!) — Others, on the contrary, (*Ep.* 215,) maintained with the Semipelagians, secundum aliqua merita humana dari gratiam Dei. A middle party followed Augustine strictly. Against the first party, Augustine wrote *De correptione et gratia;* against the second, *De gratia et libero arbitrio.* Comp. Walch's Ketzerhist. Th. 5. S. 245 ff.

[34] *Joh. Geffcken hist. Semipelagianismi antiquissima. Gotting.* 1826. 4to. — On the differences between him and Vitalis, see *August. epist.* 217. Walch's Ketzerhist. Th. 5. S. 9 ff. *Geffcken*, p. 40 seq.

[35] His writings: De institutis Cœnobiorum libb. XII. Collationes Patrum XXIV. De incarnatione Christi adv. Nestorium libb. VII. — *Opp.* ed. *Alardus Gazæus.* Duaci. 1616. 3 T. 8vo. auct. Atrebati. 1628. fol. (Reprint Francof. 1722. and Lips. 1733. fol.) — cf. *G. F. Wiggers de Joanne Cassiano Massiliensi, qui Semipelagianismi auctor vulgo perhibetur, Comment.* III. *Rostochii.* 1824 and 1825. 4to.

[36] Comp. especially, *Collat.* XIII. (according to *Wiggers*, l. c. p. 25 seq. written about A. D. 428. according to *Geffcken*, l. c. p. 6 seq. somewhat before A. D. 426.) c. 8: Adest inseparabiliter nobis semper divina protectio, tantaque est erga creaturam suam pietas creatoris, ut non solum comitetur eam, sed etiam præcedat jugi providentia. — Qui cum in nobis ortum quendam bonæ voluntatis inspexerit,

heard of this party (afterwards called Semipelagians), through his zealous followers, Prosper of Aquitania, and Hilarius (A. D. 429),[37] and attempted to bring them over to his views in his two last works, (A. D. 429 – 430).[38] After the death of Augustine, Prosper (+ 460 or later)[39] continued the controversy with greater violence, but could not prevent the Semipelagian views from spreading, especially in Gaul. To this party belonged, also, Vincentius Lirinensis, (+ about 450,) whose *Commonitorium* was long considered the model of Catholicism in the West.[40]

---

illuminat eam confestim, atque confortat, et incitat ad salutem, incrementum tribuens ei, quam vel ipse plantavit, vel nostro conatu viderit emersisse. — Et non solum sancta desideria benignus inspirat, sed etiam occasiones præstruit vitæ, et opportunitatem boni effectus ac salutaris viæ directionem demonstrat errantibus. — c. 9: Ut autem evidentius clareat, etiam per naturæ bonum, quod beneficio creatoris indultum est, nonnunquam bonarum voluntatum prodire principia, quæ tamen nisi a Domino dirigantur, ad consummationem virtutum pervenire non possunt, Apostolus testis est dicens: *Velle adjacet mihi, perficere autem bonum non invenio* (Rom. vii. 18). — c. 12: Unde cavendum est nobis, ne ita ad Dominum omnia sanctorum merita referamus, ut nihil nisi id quod malum atque perversum est humanæ abscribamus naturæ. — Dubitari ergo non potest, inesse quidem omni animæ naturaliter virtutum semina beneficio creatoris inserta, sed nisi hæc opitulatione Dei fuerint excitata, ad incrementum perfectionis non poterunt pervenire. *Collat.* III. c. 12: Nullus justorum sibi sufficit ad obtinendam justitiam, nisi per momenta singula titubanti ei et corruenti fulcimenta manus suæ supposuerit divina clementia. cf. *Wiggers*, l. c. p. 33 seq. *Geffcken*, l. c. p. 11 seq.

[37] Ep. *Prosperi* ad August. amongst the letters of Augustine. Ep. 225, Ep. Hilarii 226.

[38] De prædestinatione Sanctorum liber ad Prosperum. De dono perseverantiæ liber ad Prosperum et Hilarium, (s. liber secundus de prædest. Sanct.).

[39] Writings: Epistola ad Rufinum de gratia et libero arbitrio. Carmen de ingratis. Epigrammata II. in obtrectatorem S. Augustini, all from A. D. 429 to 430. — Epitaphium Nestorianæ et Pelagianæ hæreseos, 431. — Against new opponents (comp. Walch, Th. 5, S. 67 ff. *Geffcken, l. c. p.* 32): Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula objectionum Gallorum calumniantium. Pro Augustini doctrina resp. ad capitula objectionum Vincentianarum. Pro Augustino respons. ad excerpta, quæ de Genuensi civitate sunt missa. *De gratia Dei et libero arbitrio l. contra Collatorem* (about A. D. 432), etc. Besides these, his *Chronicon* (to A. D. 455). — *Opp.* ed. *Jo. le Brun de Marette et D. Mangeaut. Paris.* 1711. fol. cum var. lectt. ex Codd. Vatic. *Romæ.* 1758. 8vo.

[40] Commonitorium pro catholicæ fidei antiquitate et universitate adv. profanas omnium hæreticor. novitates. Numberless editions: amongst others, cum August. de doctr. Christ. ed. *G. Calixtus.* Helmst. 1629. 8vo. (ed. II. 1655. 4to.) cum Salviani opp. ed. *St. Baluzius.* (Paris. 1663. ed. II. 1669. ed. III. 1684. 8vo.) ed. *Engelb. Klüpfel.* Viennæ. 1809. 8vo. *Vossius, Norisius, Natalis Alexander, Oudinus* de scriptt. eccl. I. p. 1231 seq. *Geffcken*, l. c. p. 53 seq. have shown that this Vincentius is the one who was attacked by Prosper, and that even in the Commonitorium traces of Semipelagianism are to be found. On the other side vid. Act. SS. Maji, vol. V. p. 284 seq. Hist. littéraire de la France, T. II. p. 309.

III. CONTROVERSIES CONCERNING THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

§ 86.

NESTORIAN CONTROVERSY.

SOURCES. — Nestor's own account of this controversy (vid. *Evagrius* h. e. I. 7,) was made use of by Irenæus (*Comes*, and from A. D. 444–448. Bp. of Tyre), in his tragœdia, or *Comm. de rebus in synodo Ephesina, ac in Oriente toto gestis.* This work of Irenæus is lost; but in the sixth century, the documents which were affixed to it, were translated into Latin in the *Synodicon*, (vid. Variorum Epist. ad Conc. Eph. pertinentes ex Ms. Casin. ed. Chr. Lupus. 1682). — See also *Marius Mercator Opp.* P. II. (vid. preceding sec., note 30). Also Mansi IV. p. 567 seq. — Account of this controversy by Ibas, bishop of Edessa, in the *Epist. ad Manin Persam*, (mostly contained in the Actis Conc. Chalced. Act. X. in Mansi VII. p. 241.) — Liberatus (Archdeacon in Carthage A. D. 553), breviarium causæ Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum (ed. Jo. Garnerius. Paris. 1675. 8vo. in Mansi IX. p. 659, and in Gallandii Bibl. PP. XII. p. 119). — Also Socrates VII. c. 29 seq. *Evagrius*, I. c. 7 seq. Walch's Ketzerhistorie, Th. 5, p. 289 ff. — Wundemann's Geschichte d. Glaubenslehre, Th. 2, p. 265 ff. — Münscher's Dogmengeschichte, Bd. 4, p. 53 ff.

Though all who were not heretics agreed in believing that Christ was at once perfect God and man, with regard to the mode of union, and the mutual relation of the two natures, there were, as yet, no fixed views or forms of expression. The theologians in the East indeed had been led, by their historico-critical principles, and particularly by their contest with the followers of Apollinaris, to distinguish the two natures, and the expressions used concerning them, with more exactness; and this accuracy of distinction had been confirmed and made universal, by the widely-circulated writings of Diodorus, bishop of Tarsus,[1] and Theodorus, bishop of Mopsuestia.[2] But the Egyptians, with their

---

[1] See § 82, note 19.

[2] Comp. especially Theodore's confession of faith (Act. Conc. Ephesini Act. VI. Mansi T. IV. p. 1347. Latin in Marius Mercator. vid. Walch. bibl. symb. vetus p. 203 seq.): — Χρὴ δὲ καὶ περὶ τῆς οἰκονομίας, ἣν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμετέρας σωτηρίας ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὸν δεσπότην Χριστὸν οἰκονομίᾳ ὁ δεσπότης ἐξετέλεσε θεὸς, εἰδέναι ὅτι ὁ δεσπότης θεὸς λόγος ἄνθρωπον εἴληφε τέλειον, ἐκ σπέρματος ὄντα Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Δαυὶδ, — ἐκ ψυχῆς τε νοερᾶς καὶ σαρκὸς συνεστῶτα ἀνθρωπίνης. ὃν ἄνθρωπον ὄντα καθ' ἡμᾶς τὴν φύσιν, πνεύματος ἁγίου δυνάμει ἐν τῇ τῆς παρθένου μήτρᾳ διαπλασθέντα, γενόμενον ὑπὸ γυναικὸς καὶ γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον — ἀπορρήτως συνῆψεν ἑαυτῷ. θανάτου μὲν αὐτὸν κατὰ νόμον ἀνθρώπων πειρασθῆναι κατασκευάσας, ἐγείρας δὲ ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ ἀναγαγὼν εἰς οὐρανὸν, καὶ καθίσας ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵθεν δὴ ὑπεράνω πάσης ὑπάρχων ἀρχῆς, καὶ ἐξουσίας — τὴν παρὰ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως δέχεται προσκύνησιν, ὡς ἀχώριστον πρὸς τὴν θείαν φύσιν ἔχων τὴν συνάφειαν, ἀναφορᾷ θεοῦ καὶ ἑνοίᾳ πάσης αὐτῷ τῆς κτίσεως τὴν προσκύνησιν ἀπονεμούσης. Καὶ οὔτε δύο φαμὲν υἱοὺς, οὔτε δύο κυρίους. ἐπειδὴ εἷς θεὸς κατ' οὐσίαν ὁ θεὸς λόγος —, ᾧπερ οὖτος συνημμένος τε καὶ μετέχων θεότητος κοινωνεῖ

characteristic tendency to mysticism, were naturally led to dwell more on the Divine nature in Christ, and, adopting the expression of Athanasius, '*God manifest in the flesh*,'[3] had gradually accustomed themselves to think of Christ only as God.[4] It is worthy of remark that, shortly before Nestor appeared, a Gallic monk, by name Leporius, (about the year 426,) was forced to confess that God was born of the virgin Mary.[5]

τῆς υἱοῦ προσηγορίας τε καὶ τιμῆς· καὶ κύριος κατ' οὐσίαν ὁ θεὸς λόγος, ᾧ συνημμένος οὗτος κοινωνεῖ τῆς τιμῆς. —"Ἑνα τοίνυν τὸν κυρίόν φαμεν καὶ κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο· πρωτοτύπως μὲν τὸν θεὸν λόγον νοοῦντες, τὸν κατ' οὐσίαν υἱὸν θεοῦ καὶ κύριον, συνεπινοοῦντες δὲ σὸ λη φθὲν, Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲθ, ὃν ἔχρισεν ὁ θεὸς πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει, ὡς ἐν τῇ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν λόγον συναφείᾳ υἱότητός τε μετέχοντα καὶ κυριότητος. Ὅς καὶ δεύτερος Ἀδὰμ κατὰ τὸν μακάριον καλεῖται Παῦλον, κ. τ. λ.

[3] *Athanas. de incarnat. verbi* (*Mansi* IV. p. 689): Ὁμολογοῦμεν καὶ εἶναι αὐτὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ θεὸν κατὰ πνεῦμα, υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου κατὰ σάρκα· οὐ δύο φύσεις τὸν ἕνα υἱὸν, μίαν προσκυνητὸν καὶ μίαν ἀπροσκύνητον· ἀλλὰ μίαν φύσιν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένην, καὶ προσκυνουμένην μετὰ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ μιᾳ προσκυνήσει. As this passage is cited so early as by Cyril, (lib. de recta fide ad Imperatrices, § 9), its genuineness can hardly be doubted. So too in Julii Ep. Rom. epist. ad Dionysium (Mansi II. p. 1191 seq.), cited by Gennadius (about A. D. 490), the μία φύσις is plainly maintained. But Eutyches (see below, § 87, note 5), and the later Monophysites, appealing continually to the authority of Athanasius, the Roman bishops, Felix (A. D. 270–275), Julius (337–352), and Gregory Thaumaturgus, as unam naturam Dei verbi decernentes post unitionem,— whose testimonies have been collected by Cyril in libb. adv. Diodorum et Theodorum (vid. Collatio Catholicum cum Severianis A. D. 351, in Mansi VIII. p. 820.),— the Catholics began to assert that these testimonies had been interpolated by Apollinarists (see Collatio l. c. p. 821. Leontius de sectis act. VIII.: On the other hand, the genuineness of the passage from Athanasius is acknowledged by Eulogius, bishop of Alexandria about A. D. 580. ap. Phot. cod. 230, and the genuineness of Julius' letter by Ephræmius, bishop of Antioch about A. D. 526, ap. Photius cod. 228). This view has been retained by many of the moderns, especially amongst the Catholics, and defended, with reference to the letters of Julius, by *Muratori* Anecdota Græca, p. 341, with reference to all the passages above-named, by *Le Quien* Dissert. Damasc. II. prefixed to his ed. of Joannes Damasc. T. I. p. 32 seq. Comp. on the other hand, *Salig de Eutychianismo ante Eutychen. Guelpherbyt.* 1723. p. 140 seq. p. 305 seq. — Also *Julii Ep. od Prosdocium* (erroneously *ad Docimum*), in which the expression ἄνθρωπος ὑπὸ θεοῦ προσληφθεὶς is rejected, although cited as genuine by the *Conc. Ephes.*, by Cyril, Marius Mercator, Facundus, and Eulogius, is pronounced a production of Apollanarists by Le Quien and Coustant, on the authority of Leontius. On the other side: Julii I. ad Prosdocium Epist. de trinitate et incarnatione, quam ex cod. Oxon. edit, vertit, vindicat, et illustrat. J. G. Ehrlich. Lips. 1750. 4to.

[4] Thus Mary is called θεοτόκος by Athanasius Orat. III. contr. Arian. c. xiv. 33. Didymus de trin. I. 31, 94. II. 4, 133. *Hesychius*, presb. at Jerusalem, († A. D. 343,) calls David θεοπάτωρ (Photius Cod. 275). In many apochryphal writings, James is called ἀδελφόθεος (see Thilo Acta Thomæ in the notit. on p. X. seq.— Comp. Photius cod. 112).

[5] Comp. Epistola Episcop. Africæ ad Episc. Galliæ and Leporii libellus emendationis (prim. ed. *Jac. Sirmond.* Paris. 1630. *Mansi* T. IV. p. 517 seq.). In the last: Tametsi Christum filium Dei tunc etiam natum de sancta Maria non negaremus, sicut ipsi recordamini; sed minime attendentes ad mysterium fidei non ipsum Deum hominem natum, sed perfectum cum Deo natum hominem dicebamus; pertimescentes scilicet, ne divinitati conditionem adsignaremus humanam. His present faith: Confitemur dominum ac Deum nostrum Jesum Christum unicum filium Dei, qui ante sæcula natus ex patre est, novissimo tempore de Spiritu sancto et Maria semper virgine factum hominem, Deum natum: et confitentes

Nestor, a presbyter of Antioch, having been made bishop of Constantinople in the year 428, was regarded with envious dislike by his disappointed rivals in that city, whilst he was jealously watched[6] by Cyril, the nephew and worthy successor of the odious Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, (+ 444.)[7] [Vid. § 83. — Tr.]

Nestor soon gave Cyril an opportunity of attacking him, by denying the propriety of calling the virgin Mary *θεοτόκος* (mother of God).[8] Cyril immediately taxed him with heresy, and, this being disregarded, resolved on his ruin. By misrepresenting the doctrines of Nestor to

---

utramque substantiam carnis et Verbi, unum eundemque Deum atque hominem inseparabilem pia fidei credulitate suscepimus; et ex tempore susceptæ carnis sic omnia dicimus, quæ erant Dei, transisse in hominem, ut omnia, quæ erant hominis in Deum venirent; ut hac intelligentia verbum factum sit caro, non ut conversione aut mutabilitate aliqua cœperit esse quod non erat, sed ut potentia divinæ dispensationis Verbum patris, nunquam a patre discedens, homo proprie fieri dignaretur, incarnatusque sit unigenitus secreto illo mysterio, quod ipse novit. Nostrum namque est credere, illius nosse. Ac sic, ut ipse Deus Verbum, totum suscipiens quod est hominis, homo sit, et adsumtus homo, totum accipiendo quod est Dei, aliud quam deus esse non possit.

[6] It is possible, too, that Cyril's conduct may be in part accounted for by what *Marcellinus* (*Comes* about A. D. 534) mentions *in Chronico* (Bibl. PP. Max. IX. p. 517), ad ann. 428, directly after Nestor's appointment to the bishopric: Beatissimi Joannis Episcopi dudum malorum Episcoporum invidia exulati apud Comitatum cœpit memoria celebrari mense Sept. d. XXVI.

[7] His writings: Commentaries of no value. Adv. Nestorium libb. 5. Contra Julianum libb. 10. Homiliæ (amongst others, paschales 30). Epistolæ 61, etc. *Opp. ed. Jo. Aubert. Paris.* 1638. T. VII. fol.

[8] Extracts from Nestor's works in the Greek original, contained in the *Actis Syn. Ephesin.* and *Mansi* IV. p. 1197 seq. *Nestorii sermones* in a Latin translation by Marius Mercator (ed. Baluz. p. 53 seq.). From the first address: *θεοτόκος* i. e. puerpera Dei s. genetrix Dei Maria, an autem *ἀνθρωποτόκος* i. e. hominis genetrix? Habet matrem Deus? Ergo excusabilis gentilitas matres diis subintroducens. Paulus ergo mendax de Christi deitate dicens *ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἄνευ γενεαλογίας* (Hebr. vii. 3). — Non peperit creatura increabilem, sed *peperit hominem deitatis instrumentum.* Non creavit Deum Verbum Spiritus sanctus, — sed Deo verbo *templum fabricatus est, quod habitaret*, ex virgine. Est, et non est mortuus incarnatus Deus, sed illum, in quo incarnatus est, suscitavit: inclinatus est elevare, quod ruerat, ipse vero non cecidit. — Si jacentem elevare volueris, nonne continges corpus corpore, et te ipsum illi conjungendo elisum eriges, atque ita illi conjunctus ipse manes quod eras? Sic et illud incarnationis æstima sacramentum. Propter utentem illud *indumentum*, quod utitur, colo, propter absconditum adorans quod foris videtur: inseparabilis ab eo, qui oculis paret, est Deus. — Divido naturas, sed conjungo reverentiam. — Dominicam itaque incarnationem intremiscamus, *τὴν θεοδόχον τῷ θείῳ λόγῳ συνθεολογῶμεν μορφὴν* i. e. *susceptricem Dei formam* una ac pari qua Deum Verbum deitatis ratione veneremur, tanquam divinitatis vere inseparabilis simulacrum, tanquam imaginem absconditi judicis. Duplicem confiteamur et adoremus ut unum: duplum enim naturarum unum est propter unitatem. *Sermo* III. (ib. p. 71): Ego natum et mortuum Deum et sepultum adorare non queo. — Qui natus est et per partes incrementorum temporibus eguit, et mensibus legitimis portatus in ventre est, hic humanam habet naturam, sed Deo sane conjunctam. Aliud est autem dicere, quia nato de Maria conjunctus erat Deus ille, qui est Verbum patris, cæt. Comp. the extracts in the *Actis Syn. Eph.* p. 1197: *Ὅταν οὖν ἡ θεία γραφὴ μέλλῃ λέγειν ἢ γέννησιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, ἢ θάνατον, οὐδαμοῦ φαίνεται τιθεῖσα τὸ θεὸς, ἀλλ' ἢ Χριστὸς, ἢ υἱὸς, ἢ κύριος. — τὸ προσλαβεῖν τὸν θεὸν λόγον ἐκ τῆς χριστοτόκου παρθένου, παρὰ τῆς θείας ἐδιδάχθην γραφῆς· τὸ δὲ γεννηθῆναι θεὸν ἐξ αὐτῆς, οὐδαμοῦ ἐδιδάχθην.*

Cælestinus, bishop of Rome,[9] he gave the impression, or at least strengthened it, that they were the legitimate offspring of Pelagianism;[10] and this at once sealed Nestor's fate in the West. In vain did he represent to Cælestinus, that he rejected the expression *θεοτόκος*

---

9 *Cyrilli epist. ad Cælestinum* and *commonitorum datum Possidonio* (his ambassador) Mansi T. IV. p. 1012 seq. and p. 548, and in Constant. In this last we read: Ἡ Νεστορίου πίστις, μᾶλλον δὲ κακοδοξία. ταύτην ἔχει τὴν δύναμιν· Φησὶν ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς λόγος προεγνωκώς, ὅτι ὁ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου γεννώμενος ἅγιος ἔσται καὶ μέγας, εἰς τοῦτ' ἐξελέξατο αὐτόν, καὶ παρεσκεύασε μὲν γεννηθῆναι δίχα ἀνδρὸς ἐκ τῆς παρθένου, ἐχαρίσατο δὲ αὐτῷ τὸ καλεῖσθαι τοῖς αὐτοῦ ὀνόμασιν, καὶ ἤγειρεν αὐτόν. Ὥστε κἂν ἐνανθρωπήσας λέγηται ὁ μονογενὴς τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος, ὅτι συνῆν ἀεὶ, ὡς ἀνθρώπῳ ἁγίῳ ἐκ τῆς παρθένου, διὰ τοῦτο λέγεται ἐνανθρωπῆναι. Ὥσπερ δὲ συνῆν τοῖς προφήταις, οὕτω, φησὶ, καὶ τούτῳ κατὰ μείζονα συνάφειαν. Διὰ τοῦτο φεύγει πανταχοῦ τὸ λέγειν τὴν ἕνωσιν, ἀλλ' ὀνομάζει συνάφειαν, ὥσπερ ἐστὶν ὃς ἐξωθεν, καὶ ὡς ἂν λέγῃ πρὸς Ἰησοῦν, ὅτι καθ' ὡς ἦν μετὰ Μωσῆς, οὕτως ἔσομαι μετὰ σοῦ (Jos. i. 5). Κρύπτων δὲ τὴν ἀσέβειαν λέγει, ὅτι ἐκ μήτρας συνῆν αὐτῷ. Διὰ τοῦτο οὔτε Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν αὐτὸς εἶναι λέγει, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐν εὐδοκίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ κεκλημένον οὕτως· κἂν κύριος ὠνομάσθη, οὕτως πάλιν αὐτὸν βούλεται Κύριον, ὡς τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου χαρισαμένου αὐτῷ τὸ καλεῖσθαι καὶ οὕτω. Μὴ φησὶν, ὅτι, ὅπερ λέγομεν, ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἀναστῆναι. ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἀπέθανε, καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἀνέστη, καὶ οὐδὲν τούτο πρὸς τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον. — καὶ ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις σῶμά ἐστιν ἀνθρώπου τὸ προκείμενον· ἡμεῖς δὲ πιστεύομεν, ὅτι τοῦ λόγου ἐστὶ σὰρξ ζωοποιοῦν ἰσχυοῦσα διὰ τοῦτο, ὅτι τοῦ τὰ πάντα ζωοποιοῦντος λόγου γέγονε σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα. Nestor replies to this: (Synodicon c. VI. Mansi T. V. p. 762): Ille vero (Cyrillus) omittens mihi per epistolam declarare, si quid ei tamquam blasphemum vel impium videbatur debere notari, convictionum terrore permotus, et adjutrices ob hoc perturbationes exquirens, ad Romanum Cælestinum convertitur, quippe ut ad simpliciorem, quam qui posset vim dogmatum subtilius penetrare. Et ad hæc inveniens viri illius simplicitatem, circumfert pueriliter auires ejus illusionibus literarum, olim quidem nostra conscripta transmittens, quasi ad demonstrationem convictionum, quibus contradici non posset, tanquam ego Christum purum hominem definirem. — Excerptiones vero intertexens sermonum conscripta composuit, ne societatis compactione detegeretur illata calumnia, et quædam quidem allocutionibus nostris adjiciens, aliquorum vero partes abrumpens, et illa contexens, quæ a nobis de dominica humanatione sunt dicta, velut de puro ea homine dixerimus, etc.

10 In four orations against the Pelagians, (Latin in Marius Mercator ed. Baluz. p. 120 seq. — the fourth in the original amongst the orations of Chrysostom, ed. Montfaucon X. p. 733), Nestor had defended the doctrine of original sin. But *Marius Merc.* p. 119: Contra hæresin Pelagii seu Cælestii — quamvis recte sentiret et doceret, Julianum tamen ex Episcopo Eclanensi cum participibus suis hujus hæresis signiferum et antesignanum, olim ab apostolica sententia exauctoratum atque depositum, in amicitiam interim censuit suscipiendum. Spem enim absolutionis promittens, ipsum quoque Cælestium litteris suis — consolatus est. Hence Nestor applied, in the year 429, to the Roman bishop, Cælestinus. (*Epist. II. in Baron. ad ann.* 430, *in Coustant* amongst the *Epist. Cælest. Ep.* VI. and VII). In the first: Julianus cæt. — sæpe — Imperatorem adierunt, ac suas causas defleverunt, tamquam orthodoxi temporibus orthodoxis persecutionem passi: sæpe eadem et apud nos lamentantes. — Sed quoniam apertiore nobis de causis eorum notitia opus est, — dignare nobis notitiam de his largiri, etc. Probably Nestor found these Pelagians more orthodox in their opinions than he had expected. Soon after this, A. D. 430, Cassian, at the instance of the Roman Archdeacon (afterwards bishop), Leo, wrote his libb. VII. de incarnatione Christi adv. Nestorium (cf. Wiggers, de Jo. Cassiano). Lib. I. c. 3, he says of a heresy, newly broken out at Bellay (Beligarum urbe), to which, according to Cap. 4, Leporius was a convert: Peculiare ac proprium supradictæ illius hæreseos, quæ ex Pelagiano errore descenderat, fuit, quod dicentes quidam, solitarium hominem Jesum Christum sine ulla peccati contagione vixisse, eo progressi sunt, ut assererent, homines, si velint, sine peccato esse posse. Consequens enim existimabant, ut si homo solitarius Jesus Christus sine peccato fuisset, omnes quoque

only in its false sense.[11] He was condemned at synods held at Rome and Alexandria (A. D. 430), and twelve anathemas published by Cyril, in which he sought to fix the true doctrine concerning the person of Christ, as opposed to Nestor's heresy.[12] These anathemas

---

homines sine Dei adjutorio esse possint, quicquid ille homo solitarius sine consortio Dei esse potuisset.—Unde advertit novus nunc jam, non novæ hæreseos auctor, qui Dominum Salvatoremque nostrum solitarium hominem natum esse contendit, idem se omnino dicere, quod Pelagianistæ ante dixerunt: et consequens errori suo esse, ut qui utique sine peccato solitarium hominem Jesum Christum vixisse asserit, omnes quoque per se homines sine peccato posse esse blasphemet.—Nec dubium id est, re ipsa penitus declarante. Hinc enim illud est, quod intercessionibus suis Pelagianistarum querelas fovet, et scriptis suis causas illorum asserit, quod subtiliter his, vel, ut verius dixerim, subdole patrocinatur, et consanguineæ sibi improbitati improbo suffragatur affectu, etc. Hence *Lib.* V. c. 1, hæresim illam Pelagianæ hæreseos discipulam atque imitatricem, and c. 2 to Nestor: Ergo vides, Pelagianum te virus vomere, Pelagiano te spiritu sibilare. So too *Prosperi Epitaphium Nestoriani et Pelagiani:*

Nestoriana lues successi Pelagianæ,
Quæ tamen est utero progenerata meo.
Infelix miseræ genitrix et filia nataæ,
Prodivi ex ipso germine, quod peperi, etc.

[11] *Nestorii epist. III. ad Cælestin.* Mansi IV. p. 1021. V. p. 725, Coustant.—(Amongst the Epp. Cœlest. no. VI., VII. and XV). *Epist.* I: Unde et nos non modicam corruptionem orthodoxiæ apud quosdam hic reperientes, et ira et lenitate circa ægros quotidie utimur. Est enim ægritudo non parva, sed affinis putredini Apollinaris et Arii. Dominicam enim in homine unionem ad cujusdam contemperationis confusionem passim commiscent: adeo ut et quidam apud nos clerici—aperte blasphement Deum Verbum Patri homousion, tamquam originis initium de Christotoco virgine sumsisset, et cum templo suo ædificatus esset, et carni consepultus. Carnem dicunt post resurrectionem suam non mansisse carnem, sed in naturam transiisse deitatis.—Si quis autem hoc nomen Theotocon propter natam humanitatem conjunctam Deo Verbo, non propter parientem proponet; dicimus quidem hoc vocabulum in ea, quæ peperit, non esse conveniens (oportet enim veram matrem de eadem esse essentia ac ex se natum): ferri tamen potest hoc vocabulum—eo quod solum nominetur de virgine hoc verbum propter inseparabile templum Dei Verbi ex ipsa (natum), non quia ipsa mater sit Verbi Dei: nemo enim antiquiorem se parit. *Epist.* III: Ego autem ad hanc quidem vocem, quæ est θεοτόκος, nisi secundum Apollinaris et Arii furorem ad confusionem naturarum proferatur, volentibus dicere non resisto: nec tamen ambigo, quin hæc vox θεοτόκος illi voci cedat, quæ est χριστοτόκος, tamquam prolatæ ab Angelis et Evangeliis.—Placuit vero, Deo adjuvante, etiam synodum inexcusabiliter totius orbis terrarum indicere propter inquisitionem aliarum rerum ecclesiasticarum: nam dubitatione verborum non æstimo habituram inquisitionem difficultates, nec impedimentum esse ad tractatum divinitatis Domini Christi.

[12] To be found, with the accompanying acts of the council, amongst Cyril's letters, and in *Mansi*, T. IV. p. 1067–1082 seq. Baumgarten's theol. Streitigk. Bd. 2, S. 770 ff: I. Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ θεὸν εἶναι κατὰ ἀλήθειαν τὸν Ἐμμανουὴλ, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο θεοτόκον τὴν ἁγίαν παρθένον· γεγέννηκε γὰρ σαρκικῶς σάρκα γεγονότα τὸν ἐκ θεοῦ λόγον· ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. II. Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ, σαρκὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἡνῶσθαι τὸν ἐκ θεοῦ πατρὸς λόγον, ἵνα τε εἶναι Χριστὸν μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας σαρκὸς, τὸν αὐτὸν δηλονότι θεόν τε ὁμοῦ καὶ ἄνθρωπον, ἀ. ἤ. III. Εἴ τις ἐπὶ τοῦ ἑνὸς Χριστοῦ διαιρεῖ τὰς ὑποστάσεις μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν, μόνῃ συνάπτων αὐτὰς συναφείᾳ τῇ κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν, ἤγουν αὐθεντίαν ἢ δυναστείαν, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον συνόδῳ τῇ καθ' ἕνωσιν φυσικὴν, ἀ. ἤ. IV. Εἴ τις προσώποις δυσὶν, ἤγουν ὑποστάσεσι, τάς τε ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελικοῖς καὶ ἀποστολικοῖς συγγράμμασι διανέμει φωνὰς, ἢ ἐπὶ Χριστῷ παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων λεγομένας, ἢ παρ' αὐτοῦ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ· καὶ τὰς μὲν ὡς ἀνθρώπῳ παρὰ τὸν ἐκ θεοῦ λόγον ἰδικῶς νοουμένῳ προσάπτει, τὰς δὲ ὡς θεοπρεπεῖς μόνῳ τῷ

were answered in as many anti-anathemas by Nestor,[13] and produced great excitement amongst the Syrian bishops. Nestor had explained himself satisfactorily to John, bishop of Antioch, concerning his acceptance of the expression *θεοτόκος*; whilst Cyril seemed to go to the other extreme in his view, and to do away all distinction of two natures in Christ. On this account Cyril's anathemas were rejected in

ἐκ Θεοῦ πατρὸς λόγῳ, ἀ. ἤ. V. *Εἴ τις τολμᾷ λέγειν θεοφόρον ἄνθρωπον τὸν Χριστὸν, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον θεὸν εἶναι κατὰ ἀλήθειαν, ὡς υἱὸν ἕνα καὶ φύσει, καθὸ γέγονεν σὰρξ ὁ λόγος, καὶ κεκοινώνηκε παραπλησίως ἡμῖν αἵματος καὶ σαρκὸς, ἀ. ἤ.* VI. *Εἴ τις τολμᾷ λέγειν, θεὸν ἢ θεότητιν εἶναι τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ πατρὸς λόγον, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμολογεῖ θεὸν ὁμοῦ τε καὶ ἄνθρωπον, ὡς γεγονότος σαρκὸς τοῦ λόγου κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς, ἀ. ἤ.* VII. *Εἴ τις φησὶν, ὡς ἄνθρωπον ἐνηργῆσθαι παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ τὴν τοῦ μονογενοῦς εὐδοξίαν περιῆφθαι, ὡς ἕτερον παρ' αὐτὸν ὑπάρχοντα, ἀ. ἤ.* VIII. *Εἴ τις τολμᾷ λέγειν, τὸν ἀναληφθέντα ἄνθρωπον συμπροσκυνεῖσθαι δεῖν τῷ Θεῷ λόγῳ, καὶ συνδοξάζεσθαι καὶ συγχρηματίζειν Θεὸν, ὡς ἕτερον ἑτέρῳ (τὸ γὰρ "Σὺν" ἀεὶ προσιστάμενον, τοῦτο νοεῖν ἀναγκάζει) καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον μιᾷ προσκυνήσει τιμᾷ τὸν Ἐμμανουὴλ, καὶ μίαν αὐτῷ τὴν δοξολογίαν ἀνατέμοιτο, καθὸ γέγονε σὰρξ ὁ λόγος, ἀ. ἤ.* IX. *Εἴ τις φησὶ, τὸν ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν διδοξάσθαι παρὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, ὡς ἀλλοτρίᾳ δυνάμει τῇ δι' αὐτοῦ χρώμενον, καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ λαβόντα τὸ ἐνεργεῖν δύνασθαι κατὰ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων, καὶ τὸ πληροῦν εἰς ἀνθρώπους τὰς θεοσημείας, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον ἴδιον αὐτοῦ τὸ πνεῦμά φησι, δι' οὗ καὶ ἐνήργησε τὰς θεοσημείας, ἀ. ἤ.* X. *Ἀρχιερία καὶ ἀπόστολον τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν γεγεννῆσθαι Χριστὸν ἡ θεία λέγει γραφὴ, προσκεκομικέναι τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἑαυτὸν εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρί. εἴ τις τοίνυν ἀρχιερία καὶ ἀπόστολον ἡμῶν γεγεννῆσθαί φησιν οὐκ αὐτὸν τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ λόγον, ὅτε γέγονε σὰρξ καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἀνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ὡς ἕτερον παρ' αὐτὸν ἰδικῶς ἄνθρωπον ἐκ γυναικός· ἢ εἴ τις λέγει, καὶ ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ προσενεγκεῖν αὐτὸν τὴν προσφορὰν, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον ὑπὲρ μόνων ἡμῶν· οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἠδύν�το προσφορᾶς ὁ μὴ εἰδὼς ἁμαρτίαν· ἀ. ἤ.* XI. *Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου σάρκα ζωοποιὸν εἶναι, καὶ ἰδίαν αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐκ Θεοῦ πατρὸς λόγου, ἀλλ' ὡς ἑτέρου τινὸς παρ' αὐτὸν, συνημμένου μὲν αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν, ἤγουν ὡς μόνην θείαν ἐνοίκησιν ἐσχηκότος· καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον ζωοποιὸν, ὡς ἔφημεν, ὅτι γέγονεν ἰδία τοῦ λόγου τοῦ τὰ πάντα ζωογονεῖν ἰσχύοντος, ἀ. ἤ.* XII. *Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ, τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον παθόντα σαρκὶ, καὶ ἐσταυρωμένον σαρκὶ, καὶ θανάτου γευσάμενον σαρκὶ, γεγονότα τε πρωτότοκον ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καθὸ ζωὴ τέ ἐστι καὶ ζωοποιὸς, ὡς θεὸς, ἀ. ἤ.*

[13] Marius Mercator, ed. Baluz. p. 142 seq. Baumgarten's theol. Streitigk. B. 2, S. 774 ff. I. Si quis eum, qui est Emmanuel, Deum verbum esse dixerit, et non potius nobiscum Deum, hoc est, inhabitasse eam quæ secundum nos est naturam, per id quod unitus est massæ nostræ, quam de Maria virgine suscepit: matrem etiam Dei verbi, et non potius ejus, qui Emmanuel est, s. virginem nuncupaverit, ipsumque Deum verbum in carnem versum esse, quam accepit ad ostentationem Deitatis suæ, ut habitu inveniretur ut homo, anath. sit. II. Si quis in verbi Dei conjunctione, quæ ad carnem facta est, de loco in locum mutationem divinæ essentiæ dixerit esse factam: ejusque divinæ naturæ carnem capacem dixerit, ac partialiter unitam carni: aut iterum in infinitum incircumscriptæ naturæ coëxtenderit carnem ad capiendum Deum, eandemque ipsam naturam et Deum dicat et hominem, anath. sit. — IV. Si quis eas voces, quæ tam in evangelicis quam in epistolis apostolicis de Christo, qui est ex utraque natura, scriptæ sunt, accipiat tanquam de una natura; ipsique dei verbo tentat passiones tribuere, tam secundum carnem, quam etiam deitatem, anath. sit. — VI. Si quis post incarnationem Deum verbum alterum quempiam præter Christum nominaverit; servi sane formam initium non habere a Deo Verbo, et increatam, ut ipse est, dicere tentaverit, et non magis ab ipso creatam confiteatur, tamquam a naturali domino et creatore et Deo, quam et suscitare propria virtute promisit, *Solvite*, dicens, *templum hoc, et in triduo suscitabo illud* (Joh. ii. 19); a. s. — VIII. Si quis servi formam pro se ipso, hoc est secundum propriæ naturæ rationem, colendam esse dixerit, et rerum omnium dominam: et non potius per societatem, qua beatæ et ex se naturaliter domini unigeniti naturæ conjuncta est, veneratur; a. s. — XI. Si quis unitam carnem verbo Dei ex naturæ propriæ possibilitate vivifica-

the Eastern churches, and formally refuted[14] by Andrew, bishop of Samosata, and Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus (+ A. D. 457).[15]

Under these circumstances a general council was called at Ephesus by the emperor Theodosius II. in the year 431. Cyril hastened thither, accompanied by many of his adherents, and, not regarding the bold remonstrances[16] of the honest Isidore, abbot of Pelusium

---

tricem esse dixerit; ipso Domino et Deo pronunciante: *Spiritus est, qui vivificat, caro nihil prodest* (Joh. vi. 64); anath. sit. *Spiritus est Deus*, a Domino pronunciatum est. Si quis ergo Deum Verbum carnaliter secundum substantiam carnem factum esse dicat (hoc autem modo et specialiter custodite: maxime Domino Christo post resurrectionem suam discipulis suis dicente: *Palpate et videte, quia spiritus ossa et carnem non habet, sicut me videtis habere*, Luc. xxiv. 39); a. s.

[14] The work of Andrew in Latin, Mercator, p. 220. Greek Fragm. in Cyrilli Apologeticus. That of Theodoret, see Opp. ed. Schulze, T. V. p. I. seq. In the latter we read: *Ad.* I. Ἡμεῖς δὲ — οὐ σάρκα φύσει γεγονέναι, οὐδὲ εἰς σάρκα μεταβληθῆναι τὸν Θεὸν λόγον φαμέν. — ἀλλ' ἀνέλαβε σάρκα καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, — οὐκ αὐτὸς φύσει ἐκ τῆς παρθένου γεγέννηται συλληφθεὶς, καὶ διαπλασθεὶς, — ἀλλ' ἑαυτῷ ναὸν ἐν τῇ παρθενικῇ γαστρὶ διαπλάσας, συνῆν τῷ πλασθέντι καὶ γεννηθέντι· οὐ χάριν καὶ τὴν ἁγίαν ἐκείνην παρθένον θεοτόκον προσαγορεύομεν, οὐχ ὡς θεὸν φύσει γεννήσασαν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἄνθρωπον, τῷ διαπλάσαντι αὐτὸν, ἡνωμένον θεῷ. *Ad.* II. — τὴν καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἕνωσιν παντάπασιν ἀγνοοῦμεν, ὡς ξένην. — εἰ δὲ τοῦτο βούλεται λέγειν διὰ τῆς καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἑνώσεως ὁ ταῦτα γεννήσας, ὡς κράσις σαρκὸς καὶ θεότητος γέγονεν, ἀντιρροῦμεν σὺν πάσῃ προθυμίᾳ, καὶ τὴν βλασφημίαν ἐλέγξομεν. *Ad.* III. — συνάφεια καὶ σύνοδος οὐδενὶ διαφέρουσιν. — ἓν μὲν πρόσωπον καὶ ἕνα υἱὸν καὶ Χριστὸν ὁμολογεῖν εὐσεβές· δύο δὲ τὰς ἑνωθείσας ὑποστάσεις, εἴτουν φύσεις λέγειν, οὐκ ἄτοπον, ἀλλὰ κατ' αἰτίαν ἀκόλουθον. *Ad.* IV. — τὰ μὲν θεοπρεπῶς εἰρημένα καὶ πεπραγμένα τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ προσάψομεν· τὰ δὲ ταπεινῶς εἰρημένα καὶ πεπραγμένα δούλου μορφῇ προσαρμόσομεν. *Ad.* V. — τὸν θεοφόρον ἄνθρωπον, ὡς πολλοῖς τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων εἰρημένον, οὐ παραιτούμεθα· — καλοῦμεν δὲ θεοφόρον ἄνθρωπον, οὐχ ὡς μερικήν τινα θείαν χάριν δεξάμενον, ἀλλ' ὡς πᾶσαν ἡνωμένην ἔχοντα τοῦ υἱοῦ τὴν θεότητα. *Ad.* XII. — ἔπαθε ἡ τοῦ δούλου μορφὴ, συνούσης αὐτῇ δηλονότι τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ μορφῆς, — οἰκειουμένης δὲ διὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν τὰ παθήματα. From Cyril's Apology in answer to Theodoret. *Ad.* I. — εἰ λέγοιμεν σάρκα γενέσθαι τὸν λόγον, οὐ σύγχυσιν, οὐ φυρμὸν, οὐ τροπὴν, οὐκ ἀλλοίωσιν συμβῆναι περὶ αὐτὸν φαμέν· ἡνῶσθαι δὲ μᾶλλον ἀφράστως καὶ ἀσυγχύτως σώματι ψυχὴν ἔχοντι νοερόν. *Ad.* III. — ἄνθρωπον συνῆφθαι θεῷ σχετικῶς διατείνονται, κατὰ μόνην τὴν ἀξίαν, ἤγουν αὐθεντίαν, καὶ κατὰ τὴν τῆς υἱότητος ὁμωνυμίαν. — κατὰ φύσιν, τοῦτ' ἔστιν, οὐ σχετικῶς, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν. — Theodoret wrote also pentalogium s. libb. V. de incarnatione verbi adv. Cyrillum et Patres Conc. Ephesini (Fragm. in Mercator).

[15] Writings: Valuable Commentaries, especially on the Epistles of Paul. (*J. F. Chr. Richter* de Theodoreto Epist. Pauliu. interprete comm. Lips. 1822. 8vo.) Historical writings. Hist. eccl. libb. 5. Φιλόθεος ἱστορία s. historia religiosa. — Hæreticarum fabularum libb. 5. Polemics: Ἐρανιστὴς ἤτοι Πολύμορφος libb. IV. Ἑλληνικῶν θεραπευτικὴ παθημάτων s. græcarum affectionem curatio disputt. XII. Letters. — *Opp. ed. Jac. Sirmond.* Paris. 1642. voll. IV. fol. Vol. V. s. auctarium add. *Joh. Garnier.* Paris. 1684. — ed. *J. L. Schulze et J. A. Noesselt.* Halæ. 1769–1774. T. V. 8vo.

[16] *Isid. Pelus. Epistolarum libb.* IV. *ed. Conr. Rittershusius. Heidelb.* 1605. *fol. Epist. hactenus inditæ ed. ab A. Schotto. Antv.* 1623. 8vo. and *Francof.* 1629. *fol.* — All together: *Isid. Pelus. de interpretatione divinæ scripturæ Epistolarum libb.* V. *Paris.* 1638. (incorrect). *Venet.* 1745. *fol. cf. H. A. Niemeyer de Isidori Pelusiotæ vita, scriptis et doctrina. Halæ.* 1825. 8vo. In the *Synodicon* thirteen letters are given in the old Latin translation, as having a bearing on this controversy (*prim. ed. Mansi* V. *p.* 758). The originals are in *Lib.* I. *Ep.* 25, 102, 310, 311, 323, 324, 370, 404, 405, 419. IV. 166, 211. The original of the thirteenth letter is, perhaps, in the fifth book.

(+ about the year 440),[17] or listening to any thing but the promptings of revenge, he proceeded to condemn Nestor before the arrival of the Western bishops.[18] When they came, however, they held a council with John at their head, and deposed Cyril, and his most intimate associate, Memnon, bishop of Ephesus, from their sees. The weak Theodosius had at first been much incensed at the conduct of Cyril, but this artful intriguer afterwards contrived to bring over the monks of Constantinople to his side, and, by bribery and other acts, to gain many friends at court. Thus, though the emperor in the beginning confirmed the disgrace of all three, Cyril and Memnon as well as Nestor, he was afterwards prevailed upon to reinstate the first two in their bishoprics, whilst Nestor was forced to return to his cloister at Antioch. The consequence was the separation of the Eastern church from the other churches, particularly that of Egypt. The Eastern church was too much divided, however, to stand against its opponents, especially when backed by the imperial power. Rabulas, bishop of Edessa, went over to Cyril's party, and even went so far as to attack the favorite writings of Theodore of Mopsvestia, as the real source of Nestor's error. John, too, made peace with Cyril, (A. D. 433), consenting to give up his friend Nestor on condition that Cyril would sign the confession of faith of the church at Antioch.[19] The unfortunate Nestor (who, in fact, had

---

[17] *Isid. Pelus. Epistolarum Lib.* I. *Ep.* 310 (Latin in the *Synodicon* l. c.): Προσπάθεια μὲν οὖν ἐξυδρακεῖ, ἀντιπάθεια δὲ ὅλως οὐχ ὁρᾷ. εἰ τοίνυν ἑκατέρας λήμης βούλει καθαρεῦσαι, μὴ βιαίας ἀποφάσεις ἐκβίβαζε, ἀλλὰ κρίσει δικαίᾳ τὰς αἰτίας ἐτίστρεψον. — Πολλοὶ γάρ σε κωμῳδοῦσι τῶν συνειλεγμένων εἰς Ἔφεσον, ὡς οἰκείαν ἀμυνόμενον ἔχθραν, ἀλλ' οὐ τὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὀρθοδόξως ζητοῦντα. ἀδελφιδοῦς ἐστί, φασι, Θεοφίλου, μιμούμενος ἐκείνου τὴν γνώμην. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος μανίαν σαρῇ κατεσκίδασε τοῦ Θεοφόρου καὶ Θεοφιλοῦς Ἰωάννου, οὕτως ἐπιθυμεῖ καυχήσασθαι καὶ οὗτος, εἰ καὶ σολὺ τῶν κρινομένων ἐστὶ τὸ διάφορον. *cf. Lib.* I. *Ep.* 370. Concerning Isidore's own doctrine, see *Niemeyer* l. c. p. 173 seq. 22 seq. Vater im Kirchenhist. Archiv. 1825. S. 248 seq.

[18] Their sentence *Mansi* IV. p. 1212: Ὁ βλασφημηθεὶς τοίνυν παρ' αὐτοῦ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὥρισε διὰ τῆς παρούσης ἁγιωτάτης συνόδου, ἀλλότριον εἶναι τὸν αὐτὸν Νεστόριον τοῦ ἐπισκοπικοῦ ἀξιώματος, καὶ παντὸς συλλόγου ἱεραρικοῦ. The Egyptian party (comp. p. 1139 seq.) supposed themselves to be clearly justified by the words of the symbolum of the Council of Nice, θεὸν — ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, παθόντα, etc. Hence afterwards the followers of Celestius and Pelagius were often confounded with those of Nestor, and condemned without further question. See *Mansi* IV. p. 1320. 1328. 1334. 1338. 1472. 1474.

[19] Vid. Mansi T. V. p. 305 (this was the Symbolum drawn up by Theodoret in Ephesus, and presented by the Oriental party to the emperor. Synodicon c. 17. Mansi V. p. 783. Comp. Alexandri epist. ad Theodoret. in Synod. c. 96. ibid. p. 878): Ὁμολογοῦμεν τοιγαροῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ. τὸν μονογενῆ, θεὸν τέλειον καὶ ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος · πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι' ἡμᾶς, καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα · ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ τὸν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα · δύο γὰρ φύσεων ἕνωσις γέγονε · διὸ ἕνα Χριστὸν, ἕνα υἱὸν, ἕνα κύριον ὁμολογοῦμεν. Κατὰ ταύτην τὴν τῆς ἀσυγχύτου ἑνώσεως ἕνωσιν ὁμολογοῦμεν τὴν ἁγίαν παρθένον θεοτόκον, διὰ τὸ τὸν θεὸν λόγον σαρκωθῆναι καὶ ἐνανθρωπῆσαι, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς συλλήψως ἑνῶσαι ἑαυτῷ τὸν ἐξ αὐτῆς ληφθέντα ναὸν · τὰς δὲ εὐαγγελικὰς καὶ ἀποστολικὰς περὶ τοῦ κυρίου φωνὰς, ἴσμεν τοὺς θεολόγους ἄνδρας, τὰς μὲν κοινοποιοῦντας, ὡς ἐφ' ἑνὸς προσώπου, τὰς δὲ διαιροῦντας, ὡς ἐπὶ δύο φύσεων · καὶ τὰς μὲν θεοπρεπεῖς κατὰ τὴν θεότητα τοῦ Χριστοῦ,

never taught any thing irreconcilable with the very confession of faith which Cyril had now signed), was banished from place to place till his death in the year 440.[20] To justify this treatment, his contemporaries were forced to misrepresent his doctrine,[21] and it was so handed down to posterity, till the truth was at last discovered by men of more enlarged and clearer views.[22]

The Syrian bishops were now compelled to subscribe to the peace concluded between John and Cyril. The chief resistance was made by the theological school at Edessa, where the Persian clergy were mostly educated, — Rabulas having gone so far as to prohibit the writings of Diodorus and Theodore. Many of the teachers were expelled from the school, and betook themselves into Persia. One of them, by name Barsumas, (Barsauma), was made bishop of Nisibis (A. D. 435—489), and by his influence confirmed the Persian Christians in their attachment to Theodore, and their aversion to the doctrines of Cyril's

---

τὰς δὲ ταπεινὰς κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα αὐτοῦ παραδιδόντας. Many of the Egyptians were dissatisfied with this form, *Liberatus breviar.* c. 8. culpaverunt Cyrillum, cur susceperit ab Orientalibus Episcopis duarum confessionem naturarum, quod Nestorius dixit et docuit. cf. *Isidori Lib.* I. *Ep.* 324 *ad Cyrillum:* Χρή σι, θαυμάσις, ἄστριπτον μένειν ἀεὶ, οὔτε φόβῳ προδιδόντα τὰ οὐράνια, οὔτε σαυτῷ ἐναντίον φαινόμενον. εἰ γὰρ τὰ νῦν γεγραμμένα σοι τοῖς σροτίροις ἀντεξετάσεσιας, ἢ κολακείας φανήσῃ ὑπεύθυνος, εὐχερείας ἢ διάκονος, κενῆς μὲν δόξης ἡττώμενος, τῶν μεγάλων δὲ ἁγίων ἀθλητῶν τοὺς ἀγῶνας οὐ μιμησάμενος, οἳ τὸν ἅπαντα βίον ἐπ' ἀλλοτρίας κακουχεῖσθαι ὑπέμειναν, ἢ κακόδοξον φρόνημα, κἂν μέχρις ὧτων εἰσδέξασθαι. As this letter is placed in the Synodicon (vid. above, note 16), amongst those relating to this controversy, it cannot well refer to any thing but the truce in question. This has been questioned, it is true, by the late Dr. Vater (Kirchenh. Archiv. 1825. Heft 2. S. 211 ff.), on the ground that Cyril could sign the Symbolum without renouncing his earlier heological opinions. But let any one compare the close of the Antiochian Symbolum with Cyril's fourth anathema, and decide. It is sufficient, however, that we know that he was, beyond all question, accused of inconsistency. He had frequent occasion to defend himself against the charge in various letters (Liberatus c. 9); and it was repeated afterwards by the Monophysites. Vid. Timothei Æluri fragm. in Leontii Apolog. Conc. Chalced. (in Gallandii bibl. PP. XII. p. 737. Mansi VII. p. 841).

[20] See Nestor's own account in Evagrius I. 7.

[21] e. g. *Cassianus* above, note 10. *Leo in Epist. ad Leonem Aug.* (Quesn. 135. Baller. 165): Anathematizetur ergo Nestorius, qui beatam virginem Mariam non Dei, sed hominis tantummodo credidit genitricem, ut aliam *personam* carnis faceret, aliam deitatis: nec unum Christum in Verbo Dei et carne sentiret, sed separatim atque sejunctim alterum filium Dei, alterum hominis prædicaret. Still more misrepresented in the Appendix to *Augustin. de hæresibus:* Nestoriani a Nestorio episcopo, qui contra catholicam fidem dogmatizare ausus est, Dominum nostrum J. C. hominem tantum: nec id, quod mediator Dei et hominum effectus est, in utero virginis de Spiritu S. fuisse conceptum, sed postea Deum homini fuisse permixtum, etc. Such were the sources from which the middle ages took their notions of Nestorianism.

[22] First Luther (Von den Concilien in Walch's Ausg. Th. XVI. S. 2705). After him many others (P. Bayle, S. and J. Basnage, Christ. Kortholt, also Rich. Simon, L. Ell. *Du Pin, L. Maraccius,* etc.) pronounced it a mere controversy of words. So also *P. E. Jablonski* de Nestorianismo. — Berl. 1724. 8vo. and *Chr. A. Salig* de Eutychianismo ante Eutychen. Guelpherb. 1723. 4to. p. 284, 307. Jablonski was answered by P. Berger, J. Wessel, and especially C. G. Hoffmann, vid. Walchii bibl. theol. T. III. p. 773 seq. comp. *J. Vogt* de recentissimis Nestorii defensoribus in d. bibl. hæresiol. T. I. fasc. 3. p. 456 seq.

council at Ephesus. Ibas, the successor of Rabulas at Edessa, (bishop from 436–457), though at peace with Cyril, was a zealous friend of the views of the Antioch school, and even translated the writings of Theodore into Syriac. Afterwards, however, the persecution of these doctrines was renewed, the school at Edessa was destroyed (A. D. 489), and its few remaining friends fled into Persia. The Persian church had now broken off all intercourse with the churches of the Roman empire, and this separation was encouraged on political grounds by their king Pherozes, (A. D. 461–488). They were called Nestorians by their opponents, but called themselves Chaldean Christians, and in India, Thomas-Christians. They are found in every part of Asia, and were of great use in diffusing the learning of Greece in that part of the world, as well as in founding schools and hospitals. At a later period they became the instructers of the Arabians.[23]

§ 87.

EUTYCHIAN CONTROVERSY.

SOURCES: *Breviculus historiæ Eutychianistarum s. gesta de nomine Acacii,*[1] — reaches to the year 486, — according to the conjecture of Ballerinus, written by Pope Gelasius (vid. Mansi VII. p. 1060). — *Liberati breviarum*, and the last extracts in the Synodicon (vid. notices prefixed to § 86). — Evagrius I. c. 9. — Collection of Acts of Councils in Mansi T. VI. and VII.

Walch's Ketzerhistorie, Th. 6, p. 1–640. — Wundemann and Münscher, as prefixed to § 86.

Notwithstanding the external union between Cyril and John, there was still a difference of opinion as to the person of Christ, between the theologians of Egypt, (whom those of Palestine followed), and the theologians of the East. The Egyptians considered the doctrine of two natures in Christ, as Nestorianism,[2] whilst the others condemned

---

[23] Consult especially: *Jos. Sim. Assemanus* de Syris Nestorianis (Bibliothecæ Orient. T. III. P. II. Rom. 1728. fol.). J. S. Assem. orient. Biblioth. in einen Auszug gebracht v. A. F. Pfeiffer (Erlangen. 1776. 77. 2 Bde. 8vo.) Bd. 2. S. 329 ff. 448 ff.

[1] Concerning the three editions of this Breviculus see *Ballerini* de ant. Collection. cann. P. II. c. 12 (in *Gallandii* Sylloge ed. Mogont. T. I. p. 457), and Walchs Ketzerhistorie, Th. 6, S. 23 and 891 ff.

[2] Notwithstanding his subscription to the Antiochian symbol, Cyril still held fast the Athanasian formula *μίαν φύσιν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένην* cf. *Epistolæ* II. *ad Successum* Opp. T. V. P. II. p. 137 and 143. — *Acacii Epist. ad Cyrillum* in Synodico c. 83. Mansi T. V. p. 860. (Also c. 213, p 998, the same letter in another translation): Cogatur unusquisque publice anathematizare Nestorii et Theodori dogmata, præcipue hos, qui dicunt duas naturas post unitionem, proprie unamquamque operantem. Eorum namque, qui in Germanicia sunt aliquos experimentatus inveni quidem duos filios dicere recusantes, at vero duas naturas dicere non abnuentes. Express declaration in *Acacii epist. ad Successum* (Synod. c. 214, ibid. p. 999 seq.). e. g.: Videmus, quod is qui ex Deo patre est sermo,

the doctrine of one nature as Apollinarism.[3] The former party, however, always enjoyed the favor of the court, of which Dioscurus, the successor of Cyril (from A. D. 444–451), availed himself to put down the most zealous of his opponents, and force the Egyptian doctrines upon the Eastern church.[4]

On the other hand the Archimandrite* Eutyches was accused at Constantinople for holding these very doctrines, and condemned by his bishop, Flavianus, at a *σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα* (a *home synod*), in the year 448.[5] Leo, bishop of Rome, not only approved of this proceed-

---

inhumanatus est et incarnatus, et non sibi ex divina natura sanctum illud corpus plasmavit, sed magis ex virgine id accepit. Alioquin quomodo factus est homo, nisi quia corpus portavit humanum? Advertentes igitur, ut dixi, inhumanationis modum, videmus, quia duæ naturæ ad invicem convenerunt unitione indisrumpibili, inconfuse atque inconvertibiliter. — Et ex duabus naturis factum fuisse dicentes, veruntamen post unitionem non dividimus naturas ab invicem, nec in duos incidimus Christum, sed unum asserimus filium, et ut patres dixerunt, unam naturam verbi incarnatam. — Ergo factus est homo, non hominem recepit, ut videtur Nestorio. *Eranistes in Theodoreti* dial. II. (ed. Schulze T. IV. p. 83) says: *τὸ δέ γε ἄνθρωπον ἀποκαλεῖν τῆς οἰκουμένης τὸν σωτῆρα, σμικρύνειν ἐστὶ τοῦ δεσπότου τὴν δόξαν.* p. 106 and 114: *ὁ δύο λέγων φύσεις δύο λέγει υἱούς.* p. 114: *Ἐγὼ τὴν θεότητα λέγω μεμενηκέναι, καταποθῆναι δὲ ὑπὸ ταύτης τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, ὡς ἡ θάλασσα μέλιτος προσλαβοῦσα σταγόνα. Φροῦδος γὰρ εὐθὺς ἡ σταγὼν ἐκείνη γίνεται, τῷ τῆς θαλάττης ὕδατι μιγνυμένη.* (The same view in *Gregor. Nyss*, *Antirrhet. Adv. Apolinar.* § 42. Münschers Dogmengesch. Bd. 4. S. 37). Several went still further, see *Isidor. Pelus* lib. I. *epist.* 496 *ad Constantinum*: *Οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ζῆλός σου κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν. — τοὺς τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβῶς προσβεύοντας διώκεις, ἐμμανῶς, σύγχυσίν τινα καὶ ἀνάκρασιν καὶ τροπὴν τὴν εἰς σάρκα τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου κατηχῶν ἢ ἀλλοιῶν τὴν θείαν φυσιν εἰς σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα, ἢ τὴν ἀλήθειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ἀθετῶν.* cf. *Epist.* 419.

[3] About this time Theodoret wrote against the Egyptians his *Apologia pro Diodoro et Theodoro Mopsvest.* now lost — also the *Eranistes* (ed. Schulze T. IV. p. 1 seq.).

[4] *Irenæus*, bishop of Tyre, deposed (Theodosii II. lex, Mansi V. 417 and Theodoreti epist. 110), persecution of *Ibas* (Liberati breviar. c. 10) and *Theodoretus* (Theodoreti epist. 79. seq.). — *Theodoreti epist.* 101: *πάντων ὁμοῦ τῶν τῆς ἀνατολῆς θεοφιλεστάτων ἐπισκόπων κατέχειαν τὴν λοιδορίαν οἱ τοῦ ψεύδους ἐργάται, καὶ τὰς ἐκκλησίας ζάλης ἐνέπλησαν. Epist.* 95, *ad Antioch. Præfectum*: *ἐπαμυνάτω τοίνυν αὐτοῖς (τοῖς ἐπισκόποις) τὸ ὑμέτερον μέγεθος, καὶ τῆς συκοφαντουμένης ἐφᾶς κηδόμενον, καὶ τῆς ἀποστολικῆς προκηθούμενον πίστεως.*

* [Archimandrite — Abbot, or head of a convent. Vid. § 93. — Tr.]

[5] The Acts of this synod are in the Acts of the council of Chalcedon. Actio I. Mansi T. VI. p. 649 seq. Eutyches complains, p. 700, that he has been accused of saying *ὅτι γε δὴ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ τὴν σάρκα ὁ θεὸς λόγος κατενήνοχεν, ὡς αὐτὸς ἀνεύθυνος συγχάνει τῆς τοιαύτης λοιδορίας.* To the question, p. 741: *Ὁμολογεῖς ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιον τῇ μητρὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα τὸν αὐτὸν ἕνα υἱὸν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν*; he answers: *Ἐπειδὴ ὁμολογῶ θεόν μου, καὶ κύριον οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ἕως σήμερον φυσιολογεῖν ἐμαυτῷ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω. ὁμοούσιον δὲ ἡμῖν ἕως νῦν οὐκ εἶπον περὶ τούτου, ὁμολογῶ. — ἕως σήμερον οὐκ εἶπον τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν, τὴν δὲ ἁγίαν παρθένον ὁμολογῶ εἶναι ἡμῖν ὁμοούσιον, καὶ ὅτι ἐξ αὐτῆς ἐσαρκώθη ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν.* To this the reply being made: *τῆς μητρὸς ὁμοουσίου ἡμῖν οὔσης, πάντως καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁμοούσιος ἡμῖν ἐστιν*, he rejoined *ἕως σήμερον οὐκ εἶπον· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ σῶμα θεοῦ αὐτὸ ὁμολογῶ, (προσίσχεις;) οὐκ εἶπον σῶμα ἀνθρώπου τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ σῶμα, ἀνθρώπινον δὲ τὸ σῶμα, καὶ ὅτι ἐκ τῆς παρθένου ἐσαρκώθη ὁ κύριος. εἰ δὲ δεῖ εἰπεῖν ἐκ τῆς παρθένου, καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν, καὶ σοῦτο λέγω, κύριε.* To the question, p. 744: *Ὁμοούσιον, καὶ ἐκ δύο φύσεων μετὰ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐκ τῆς παρθένου*

ing, but in his *Epistola ad Flavianum*,[6] entered into a full discussion of the disputed point, by no means to the advantage of the Egyptians. It is true that in a general synod at Ephesus (A. D. 449), the bishops were compelled to decide in favor of Eutyches and the Egyptian doctrines (*σύνοδος ληστρική*, Theophanis chronograph. p. 86. — *Latrocinium Ephesinum*, Leo ad Pulcheriam, Ep. 75, ed. Quesn.): but the death of Theodosius II. just at this juncture (A. D. 450), wholly changed the posture of affairs. The new rulers, Pulcheria, and her husband Mar-

---

λίγεις ἢ οὔ; he answered: Ὁμολογῶ ἐκ δύο φύσεων γεγεννῆσθαι τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν πρὸ τῆς ἑνώσεως· μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἕνωσιν, μίαν φύσιν ὁμολογῶ. On his refusing to acknowledge two natures in Christ, and anathematize the contrary opinion, the sentence was passed, p. 748: Διὰ πάντων περιῴκραται Εὐτυχὴς ὁ πάλαι πρεσβύτερος καὶ ἀρχιμανδρίτης — τὴν Οὐαλεντίνου καὶ Ἀπολιναρίου κακοδοξίαν νοσῶν. — ὅθεν ἐπιδακρύσαντες, καὶ στενάξαντες ἐπὶ τῇ παντελεῖ ἀπωλείᾳ αὐτοῦ, ὡρίσαμεν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ βλασφημηθέντος, ἀλλότριον αὐτὸν εἶναι παντὸς ἱερατικοῦ τάγματος, καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς κοινωνίας, καὶ τοῦ προεστάναι μοναστηρίου. Comp. Epist. *Eutychetis ad Leonem Papam* (Synodicon c. 222, Mansi T. V. p. 1015): Expetebar duas naturas fateri, et anathematizare eos, qui hoc negarent. Ego autem metuens definitionem a synodo, nec adimere nec addere verbum contra expositam fidem a sancta synodo Nicæna (cf. § 86, note 18), sciens vero sanctos et beatos patres nostros Julium, Felicem, Athanasium, Gregorium sanctissimos episcopos refutantes duarum naturarum vocabulum, etc. In the confession of faith annexed (ibid. c. 223): Ipse enim, qui est verbum Dei, descendit de cœlo sine carne, et factus est caro in utero sanctæ virgini ex ipsa care virginis incommutabiliter et inconvertibiliter, sicut ipse novit et voluit. Et factus est, qui est semper Deus perfectus ante sæcula, idem et homo perfectus in extremo dierum propter nos et nostram salutem. In the exhibitions of the opinions of Eutyches by others, the doctrine of an apparent body, or the transformation of the Logos into flesh, is attributed to him. Thus *Theodoret.* hær. fab. comp. IV. 13. *Gelasius* de duabus naturis in Christo adv. Eutychem et Nestorium. — Eutyches is defended by the Jesuit *Gabriel Vasquez* (commentarii in Thomam. Ingolst. 1606. fol. in Part III. Thomæ disp. XIV. c. 1), *Archibald Bower* (History of the Popes, vol. II. p. 31, 61 seq.), and others.

[6] ed. *Quesnell. Ep.* 24, ed. *Baller. Ep.* 28, c. 2: Fecunditatem virgini Spiritus S. dedit, veritas autem corporis sumta de corpore est; et *ædificante sibi sapientia domum* (Prov. ix. 1). *Verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis*: hoc est, in ea carne, quam assumsit ex homine, et quam spiritu vitæ rationalis animavit. c. 3: Salva igitur proprietate utriusque naturæ et substantiæ, et in unam coeunte personam, suscepta est a majestate humilitas, a virtute infirmitas, ab æternitate mortalitas: et ad resolvendum conditionis nostræ debitum natura inviolabilis naturæ est unita passibili: ut, quod nostris remediis congruebat, unus atque idem mediator Dei et hominum, homo Jesus Christus, et mori posset ex uno, et mori non posset ex altero. In integra ergo veri hominis perfectaque natura verus natus est Deus, totus in suis, totus in nostris. — Assumsit formam servi sine sorde peccati, humana augens, divina non minuens. — Tenet enim sine defectu proprietatem suam utraque natura: et sicut formam servi Dei forma non adimit, ita formam Dei servi forma non minuit. — c. 4: Nova autem nativitate generatus: quia inviolata virginitas, quæ concupiscentiam nescivit, carnis materiam ministravit. Assumta est de matre Domini natura, non culpa: nec in Domino Jesu Christo, ex utero virginis genito, quia nativitas est mirabilis, ideo nostri est natura dissimilis. Qui enim verus est Deus, idem verus est homo: et nullum est in hac unitate mendacium, dum invicem sunt et humilitas hominis et altitudo Deitatis. Sicut enim Deus non mutatur miseratione, ita homo non consumitur dignitate. Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione quod proprium est: Verbo scilicet operante, quod Verbi est, et carne exequente quod carnis est. Unum horum coruscat miraculis, aliud succumbit injuriis. Et sicut Verbum ab æqualitate paternæ gloriæ non recedit, ita caro naturam nostri generis non relinquit. Unus enim idemque est, quod sæpe dicendum est, vere Dei

cian, were as partial to Leo as they were hostile to Dioscurus.[7] Under their direction a new œcumenical council was held at Chalcedon (A. D. 451), at which Dioscurus was deposed on a variety of charges, the persecuted Eastern bishops declared orthodox, and Leo's Epist. *ad Flavianum* made the rule of faith on the point in dispute, the council only adding new illustrations and explanations.[8] But though the decrees of this synod received the imperial confirmation and support, they were looked upon as Nestorian by many of the churches in Egypt and Palestine, and this proved the beginning of the tedious Monophysite controversy.

---

filius et vere hominis filius. — Quem itaque sicut hominem diabolica tentat astutia, eidem sicut Deo angelica famulantur officia. Esurire, sitire, lassescere, atque dormire evidenter humanum est. Sed V panibus V millia hominum satiare, et largiri Samaritanæ aquam vivam, cujus haustus bibenti præstet, ne ultra jam sitiat; supra dorsum maris plantis non desidentibus ambulare, et elationes fluctuum increpara tempestate consternere: sine ambiguitate divinum est. Sicut ergo, ut multa præteream, non ejusdem naturæ est, flere miserationis affectu amicum martuum, et eundem remoto quatriduanæ aggere sepulturæ, ad vocis imperium excitare redivivum: ita non ejusdem naturæ est, dicere: *Ego et Pater unum sumus* (Jo. x. 30), et dicere: *Pater major me est* (Jo. xiv. 28). — *J. J. Griesbach* diss. locos communes theologicos, collectos ex Leone M. sistens. Halæ. 1768. Sect. III. (*in Ejusd. Opusc. acad. ed. Gabler.* vol. I. p. 45 seq.). Epistalam, etc. ed. *H. Ph. C. Henke.* Helmst. (Weihnachtsprogramm. 1780. The Prolegomena is reprinted in *Henke* opusc. acad. Lips. 1802. 8vo. p. 59 seq.). The remark of Henke is very important, that there is no mention whatever of Nestor in the letter.

[7] The Alexandrian Sophronius even accused Dioscurus in Chalcedon of having opposed the acknowledging of Marcian's authority in Egypt (*Mansi* VI. p. 1033) ἑαυτὸν γὰρ μᾶλλον βασιλεύειν ἤθελε τῆς Αἰγυπτιακῆς διοικήσεως. But no notice was taken of this accusation by the council, and we find no other trace of it.

[8] Concerning the remarkable circumstances and the opposition of the Roman legates see the protocol Actio V. in Mansi T. VII. p. 97 seq. S. 108: Ὅρος τῆς ἐν Χαλκηδόνι τετάρτης Συνόδου. p. 116: Ἑπόμενοι τοίνυν τοῖς ἁγίοις πατρᾶσιν, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμολογεῖν υἱὸν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν συμφώνως ἅπαντες ἐκδιδάσκομεν, τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν θεότητι καὶ τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι, θεὸν ἀληθῶς καὶ ἄνθρωπον ἀληθῶς τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιον τὸν αὐτὸν ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον ἡμῖν χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας· πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτόν, δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν, ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου τῆς θεοτόκου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστὸν, υἱὸν, κύριον, μονογενῆ, ἐκ δύο φύσεων (leg. ἐν δύο φύσεσι) ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀχωρίστως γνωριζόμενον· οὐδαμοῦ τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνῃρημένης διὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν, σωζομένης δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ἰδιότητος ἑκατέρας φύσεως καὶ εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον, καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν συντρεχούσης, οὐκ εἰς δύο πρόσωπα μεριζόμενον, ἢ διαιρούμενον, ἀλλ' ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν υἱὸν καὶ μονογενῆ, θεὸν λόγον, κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν· καθάπερ ἄνωθεν οἱ προφῆται περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐξεπαίδευσε, καὶ τὸ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε σύμβολον. That the true reading is ἐν δύο φύσεσι (as all the Latins have *in duabus naturis*) is shown by *Mansi* T. VII p. 775. Vid. *Walch* bibl. symb. vetus p. 106, where we have also the evidence of the Monophysite *Severus Patr. Ant.* (Mansi VII. p. 840), *Evagrius* h. e. II. c. 4. *Leontius Byz.* de Sectis. Actio V. c. 7. *Agathonis P. Ep. ad Constantem II.* (in the *Act. Conc. œcum. VI. Act.* 4. in *Mansi XI. p.* 256).

§ 88.

OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE ŒCUMENICAL SYNODS.

In this period the decisions of the œcumenical synods* began to take a very important rank amongst the sources of theological knowledge. Like all other synods,[1] they were supposed to be under the peculiar influence of the Holy Spirit,[2] though not, therefore, absolutely infallible. Nor was any peculiar infallibility, as yet, attributed to these above other orthodox synods,[3] since not only were they enumerated together,[4] but in answering those who opposed their decrees, the aim was never to show that the council was œcumenical, but that its decisions were according to scripture and tradition.

---

* The name œcumenical (σύνοδος οἰκουμενική) occurs first Conc. Constant. ann. 381, can. 6.

[1] According to Acts xv. 28. *Conc. Carthag. ann.* 252 (in Opp. Cypriani): Placuit nobis sancto Spiritu suggerente et Domino per visiones multas et manifestas admonente. How much farther even than this they went, see Concil. Ephes. ann. 431. above, § 86, note 18. And the partial council, which condemned Eutyches at Constantinople (A. D. 448), used a similar form. See above, § 87, note 5.

[2] *Constantini Epist. ad Eccl. Alexandr.* (*Socrates* I. 9) with reference to the synod of Nice: ὁ γὰρ τοῖς τριακοσίοις ὥρισεν Ἐπισκόποις, οὐδέν ἐστιν ἕτερον, ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ γνώμη, μάλιστά γε ὅτου τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τοιούτων καὶ τηλικούτων ἀνδρῶν παῖς διανοίαις ἐγκείμενον, τὴν θείαν βούλησιν ἐξεφώτισεν. *Basilii Ep.* 114, (*al* 204) οἱ τριακόσιοι δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ — οὐκ ἄνευ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐνεργείας ἐφθέγξαντο (τὴν πίστιν). *Socrates* I. 9, against the Macedonian historian *Sabinus*, who had spoken of the Nicene fathers as ignorant men: οὐκ ἐνθυμεῖται, ὡς εἰ καὶ ἰδιῶται ἦσαν οἱ τῆς Συνόδου, κατελάμποντο δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, οὐδαμῶς ἀποχρῆσαι τῆς ἀληθείας ἐδύναντο. Thus *Isidorus Pelus. Lib.* IV. *Ep.* 99, calls the synod of Nice θεόθεν ἐμπνευσθεῖσα.

[3] *Epist. Synodi Nicænæ ad Alexandrinos* (*Theodoret.* I. 8) *in fine*: εὔχεσθε δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁπάντων, ἵνα τὰ καλῶς ἔχειν δόξαντα βέβαια μένοι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, κατ' εὐδοκίαν γεγενημένα, ὥς γε πεπιστεύκαμεν, τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. In *Socrates* I. c. 9, this passage is changed. *Augustinus de baptismo contra Donatistas II.* 3: Quis autem nesciat, sanctam scripturam canonicam — omnibus posterioribus Episcoporum litteris ita præponi, ut de illa omnino dubitari et disceptari non possit, utrum verum vel utrum rectum sit, quidquid in ea scriptum esse constiterit: Episcoporum autem litteras — per sermonem forte sapientiorem, — et per aliorum Episcoporum graviorem auctoritatem, — et per concilia licere reprehendi, si quid in eis forte a veritate deviatum est: et ipsa concilia, quæ per singulas regiones vel provincias fiunt, plenariorum conciliorum auctoritati, quæ fiunt ex universo orbe Christiano, sine ullis ambagibus cedere: *ipsaque plenaria sæpe priora posterioribus emendari*, quum aliquo experimento rerum aperitur quod clausum erat, et cognoscitur quod latebat, sine ullo typho sacrilegæ superbiæ, sine ulla inflata cervice arrogantiæ, sine ulla contentione lividæ invidiæ, cum sancta humilitate, cum pace catholica, cum caritate Christiana.

[4] *Constantinus Epist. ad Episcopos, qui Conc. Nicæno non interfuerunt* (*Euseb. de vita Const.* III. 20, and *Socrates* I. 9) says generally: πᾶν γὰρ, εἴ τι δ' ἂν ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις τῶν ἐπισκόπων συνεδρίοις πράττηται, τοῦτο πρὸς τὴν θείαν βούλησιν ἔχει τὴν ἀναφοράν. Thus, too, when the opponents of Athanasius appealed in defence of their rejection of the term ὁμοούσιον to the council held at Antioch A. D. 269, he acknowledg-

CHAPTER THIRD.

HISTORY OF THE HIERARCHY.

Planck's Geschichte der christl. kirchl. Gesellschaftsverfassung, vol. I. p. 276 ff.

§ 89.

INCREASED CONSEQUENCE OF THE CLERGY.

The Christian emperors continued to add new privileges and immunities to those granted by Constantine to the clergy. They freed them from various civil duties,[1] (though by no means from all taxes, [2]) exempted them, in certain cases, from their accountability to the civil courts of law,[3] and sanctioned the decisions of the bishops, both in

---

ed that council to be not inferior in authority to the Council of Nice. *De Synodis* c. 43: *συγκρούειν μὲν γὰρ τοῦτους πρὸς ἐκείνους ἀπρεπές· πάντες γάρ εἰσι πατέρες· διακρίνειν δὲ πάλιν, ὡς οὗτοι μὲν καλῶς, ἐκεῖνοι δὲ τοὐναντίον εἰρήκασιν, οὐχ ὅσιον· οἱ πάντες γὰρ ἐκοιμήθησαν ἐν Χριστῷ. Οὐ χρὴ δὲ φιλονεικεῖν, οὐδὲ τῶν συνελθόντων τὸν ἀριθμὸν συμβάλλειν, ἵνα μὴ δοκῶσιν οἱ τριακόσιοι τοὺς ἑλαττονας ἐπικρύπτειν· οὐδ' ἂν πάλιν τὸν χρόνον ἀναμετρεῖν, ἵνα μὴ δοκῶσιν οἱ προλαβόντες ἀφανίζειν τοὺς μετὰ ταῦτα γενομένους· οἱ πάντες γὰρ, καθὰ προείρηται, πατέρες εἰσί.*

[1] Besides the onerous municipal offices (see above, p. 204) both the clergy and the church lands were freed from the muneribus sordidis and extraordinariis (cf. *Cod. Theod. Lib.* XI. *Tit.* 15 *de extraordinariis sive sordidis muneribus* and *Gothofredi Paratitlon*), from the *metatis (Cod. Theod. Lib.* VII. *Tit.* 8 *de metatis)*, the *angariis*, and *parangariis (Cod. Theod. Lib* VIII. *Tit.* 5 *de cursu publico, angariis et parangariis)*: and to these was added lastly, the immunity of the *Clerici negotiantes* from the *lustralis conlatio (Cod. Theod. Lib.* XIII. *Tit.* 1 *de lustrali conlatione.* comp. Hegewisch hist. Versuch über die röm. Finanzen. S. 307 ff.) comp. besides the works cited Cod. Theod. Lib XVI. Tit. 2. L. 8. 10. etc. See *Binghami Origg. eccl. Lib.* V. *c.* 3. *(vol.* II. *p* 227 *seq.)* Planck, Bd. 1. S. 289 ff.

[2] Constantine did at first, indeed, release the church lands from the *tributis ordinariis* A. D. 315 (*Cod. Theod.* XI. 1, 1): but they were soon after again subjected to them, and when the council of Ariminum (359) applied to Constantius, ut juga, quæ videntur ad Ecclesiam pertinere, a publica functione cessarent, inquietudine desistente, he flatly denied them *Cod. Theod.* XVI. 2. 15. Gratian even subjected the church lands (A. D. 382) to the *extraordinariis collationibus* (*Cod. Theod.* XI. 16, 15), so also Theodosius, l. c L. 18, and it was not till the time of Honorius that they were again released from the *extraordinaria.* l. c. L. 21, 22. Comp. *Ambrosii orat. de basilicis non tradendis hæreticis*: Si tributum petit Imperator, non negamus, Agri ecclesiæ solvunt tributum. Si agros desiderat Imperator, potestatem habet vindicandorum, nemo nostrum intervenit, etc.

[3] *Lex Constantii* (*Cod. Theod.* XVI. 11, 12) A. D. 355: Mansuetudinis nostræ lege prohibemus, in judiciis Episcopos accusari. — Si quid est igitur querelarum, quod quispiam defert, apud alios potissimum Episcopos convenit explorari. *Gratiani* (*ibid. L.* 23) A. D. 376: Qui mos est causarum civilium, idem in negotiis

ecclesiastical affairs[4] and in the cases which were referred to them by the laity.[5] In addition to this, the two ancient rights of the clergy,

---

Ecclesiasticis obtinendus est: ut si qua sunt ex quibusdam dissensionibus, levibusque delictis, ad religionis observantiam pertinentia, locis suis, et a suæ Diœceseos Synodis audiantur: exceptis quæ actio criminalis ab Ordinariis extraordinariisque Judicibus, aut illustribus potestatibus audienda constituit. *Honorii* (*ibid.* L. 41) A. D. 412: Clericos non nisi apud Episcopos accusari convenit. *Valentiniani* III. (*ibid.* L. 47, A. D. 425): Clericos — Episcopali audientiæ reservamus: fas enim non est, ut divini muneris ministri temporalium potestatum subdantur arbitrio. Comp. however, *Valentiniani Novella* below, note 5. *cf. Bingham.* Lib. V. c. 2. (vol. II. p. 212 seq.) Planck, I. c. S. 297 ff.

[4] *Euseb. de vita Const.* IV. c. 27. See note 5. Comp. the law of *Honorius*, A. D. 399 (*Cod. Theod.* XVI. 11, 1): Quotiens de religione agitur Episcopos convenit judicare, cæteras vero causas, quæ ad ordinarios cognitores, vel ad usum publici juris pertinent, legibus oportet audiri.

[5] The Jews had always been accustomed to settle their controversies amongst themselves by arbitrators chosen from their own people (*Josephi Ant.* XIV. 10, 17. XVI. 6); and this custom had from the beginning been adopted by the Christians, following 1 Cor. vi. 1 ff. (*Constitt. Apost.* II. 45 — 47 *Gregor. Nyss. in vita Gregor. Thaum.* Opp. T. III. p. 554). This mode of proceeding was favored by the Roman law, see *Digest Lib.* IV. *Tit.* 8. *De receptis, qui arbitrium receperunt, ut sententiam dicant.* Till the present time this arbitration had been secured only by a penal clause inserted in the article of compromise; but now the decisions of the bishops were allowed to be made the ground of an *actio rei judicatæ*. This privilege is commonly supposed to have been granted by Constantine, on the strength of the passage *Eusebius de vita Const.* IV. c. 27: τοὺς τῶν ἐπισκόπων ὅρους τοὺς ἐν συνόδοις ἀποφανθέντας ἐπεστράγιζετο· ὡς μὴ ἐξεῖναι τοῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἄρχουσι, τὰ δόξαντα παραλύειν· παντὸς γὰρ εἶναι δικασσοῦ τοὺς ἱερεῖς τοῦ θεοῦ δοκιμωτέρους· in which σύνοδος according to *Conc. Carthag.* IV. c. 23 (see p. 272, note 6.) is understood of the Presbytery. But as these arbitrations were not pronounced by the Collegia, but even committed, sometimes, by the bishops to individual presbyters and deacons (vid *Bingham, Lib.* II. c. 7, § 5. *vol.* I. *p* 130), the passage seems rather to refer to the decisions and sentences of the Provincial synods. *Sozomenus* I. c. 9. is more distinct: τῶν δὲ Ἐπισκόπων ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὴν κρίσιν ἐπέτρεψε (Κωνσταντῖνος) τοῖς δικαζομένοις, ἢν βούλωνται τοὺς πολιτικοὺς ἄρχοντας παραιτεῖσθαι· κυρίαν δὲ εἶναι τὴν αὐτῶν ψῆφον, καὶ κρείττω τῆς τῶν ἄλλων δικαστῶν, ὡσανεὶ παρὰ τοῦ Βασιλέως ἐξενεχθεῖσαν· εἰς ἔργον δὲ τὰ κρινόμενα ἄγειν τοὺς ἄρχοντας, καὶ τοὺς διακονουμένους αὐτοῖς στρατιώτας· ἀμεταπρέπτους τε εἶναι τῶν Συνόδων τοὺς ὅρους. Still this seems to be only an amplified interpretation of the passage of Eusebius. The oldest law extant on the subject is A. D. 408. (*Cod. Justin.* I. *Tit.* 4. L. 8.) *Honor. et Theod. AA. Theodoro P. P.* Episcopale judicium ratum sit omnibus, qui se audiri a Sacerdotibus elegerint: eamque illorum judicationi adhibendam esse reverentiam jubemus, quam vestris deferri necesse est potestatibus, a quibus non licet provocare. Per judicum quoque Officia, ne sit cassa episcopalis cognitio, definitioni executio tribuatur. But as a similar privilege was granted to the Jewish patriarchs as early as A. D. 398, (*Cod. Theod.* II. 1, 10), it may fairly be supposed that it had already been enjoyed by the Christian bishops. It is possible that custom had sanctioned the practice before it became a law. The limits of the *Episcopalis audientia* are distinctly given by *Valentiniani III. Novella de episcopali judicio* (*Gothofredus-Ritter Nov. Val. Tit.* XII. in Hugo *Novell. lib.* II. *Tit.* 35): De episcopali judicio diversorum sæpe causatio est. Ne ulterius querela procedat, necesse est præsenti lege sanciri. Itaque cum inter clericos jurgium vertitur, et ipsis litigatoribus convenit, habeat Episcopus licentiam judicandi, præeunte tamen vinculo compromissi. Quod et laicis, si consentiant, auctoritas nostra permittit. Aliter eos judices esse non patimur, nisi voluntas jurgantium interposita, sicut dictum est, conditione præcedat: quoniam constat, Episcopos et Presbyteros forum legibus non habere, nec de aliis causis, secundum Arcadii et Honorii divalia constituta, quæ Theodosianum corpus ostendit, præter religionem, posse cognoscere, etc. *Bingham Lib.* II. *c.* 7. Planck,

the *right of superintending the public morals*, and the *right of interference in behalf of the unfortunate*, assumed a new importance, since the one was now extended even over the emperor himself,[6] whilst the other furnished a ground for interfering with the proceedings of the judicial tribunals.[7] This last right they seem to have exercised very boldly, especially in cases of capital punishment, which the Christians still regarded with horror.[8] The acknowledgment of this right, too, facilitated the transfer to the Christian churches of the *Right of Asy-*

Bd. I. S. 310 ff. *H. M. Hebenstreit hist. jurisdictionis ecclesiasticæ ex legibus utriusque Codicis illustrata, diss.* III. *Lips.* 177 - 378. 4to. *B. Schilling de origine jurisdictionis ecclesiasticæ in causis civilibus. Lips.* 1825. 4to.

[6] *Conc. Arelatense ann.* 314. c. 7: De præsidibus, qui fideles ad præsidatum prosiliunt, placuit ut, cum promoti fuerint, literas accipiant ecclesiasticas communicatorias (comp. p. 125, note 5); Ita tamen. ut in quibuscunque locis gesserint, ab Episcopo ejusdem loci cura de illis agatur, et cum cœperint contra disciplinam agere, tum demum a communione excludantur. Similiter et de his qui rempublicam agere volunt. *Gregor. Naz. Orat.* XVII. p. 271, addresses the δυνάσται καὶ ἄρχοντες thus: ὁ τοῦ Χριστοῦ νόμος ὑποτιθησιν ὑμᾶς τῇ ἐμῇ δυναστείᾳ καὶ τῷ ἐμῷ βήματι. ἄρχομεν γὰρ καὶ αὐτοὶ, προσθήσω δ' ὅτι καὶ τὴν μείζονα καὶ τελειωτέραν ἀρχήν. ἢ δεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑποχωρῆσαι τῇ σαρκὶ, καὶ τοῖς γηΐνοις τὰ ἐπουράνια; Thus Synesius, bishop of Ptolemais, excommunicated the Prefect Andronicus (*Synesii Ep.* 58). Comp. *Socrates* VII. c. 13, on the controversies between Orestes, prefect of Egypt, and Cyrillus, bishop of Alexandria: Ὀρέστης δὲ καὶ πρότερον μὲν ἐμίσει τὴν δυναστείαν τῶν ἐπισκόπων, ὅτι παρῃρεῦντο πολὺ τῆς ἐξουσίας τῶν ἐκ βασιλέως ἄρχειν τεταγμένων· μάλιστα δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἐπιστεύειν αὐτοῦ τὰς διατυπώσεις Κύριλλος ἐβούλετο. — Theodosius I. was compelled to do penance by Ambrose (*Rufinus* XI. 18. *Sozom.* VII. 25. *Theodoret.* V. 17). Of Theodosius II. *Theodoret.* V. 36. relates that a monk came to him περί τινος δεόμενος. ἐπειδὴ δὲ τοῦτο δράσας πολλάκις οὐκ ἔτυχε, τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς αὐτὸν κοινωνίας ἐκώλυει, καὶ τὸν δεσμὸν ἐπιθεὶς ὑπεχώρησε. Nor had the emperor any rest till this fanatic had freed him from the sentence.

[7] Vid. *Conc. Sardic.* c. 8, below, § 90, note 10. *Ambrosius de Offic. Ministr.* II. c. 29: Servanda est igitur, filii, depositis fides, adhibenda diligentia. Egregie hinc vestrum enitescit ministerium, si suscepta impressio potentis, quam vel vidua vel orphani tolerare non queant, Ecclesiæ subsidio cohibeatur, si ostendatis plus apud vos mandatum Domini, quam divitis valere gratiam. Meministis ipsi quoties adversus regales impetus pro viduarum, immo omnium, depositis certamen subierimus. Commune hoc vobiscum mihi. cf. *Thomassini vetus et nova Ecclesiæ disciplina de Beneficiis P.* II. *L.* III. *c.* 87 and *c.* 95, 96. *Bingham lib.* II. c. 8.

[8] *Augustini Ep.* 153 (*al.* 24): § 3: Morum corrigendorum nullus alius quam in hac vita locus est. — Ideo compellimur humani generis caritate intervenire pro reis ne istam vitam sic finiant per supplicium, ut ea finita non possint finire supplicium. Noli ergo dubitare hoc officium nostrum ex religione descendere, etc. Comp. the Intercession for the Circumcelliones, who were condemned to death for murder, *August. Ep.* 133 (*al.* 159) *ad Marcellinum Tribunum*: Si non audis amicum petentem, audi Episcopum consulentem. Quamvis quoniam Christiano loquor, maxime in tali causa, non arroganter dixerim, audire te Episcopum convenit jubentem. The violent interference of the clergy, such as occuired in Antioch (*Chrysostomi Ep. ad Olympiadem* and *Orat. ad popul. Antioch.* 17), was prohibited by express laws of Theodosius I. A. D. 392, and Arcadius A. D. 398 (*Cod. Theod.* IX. 40, L. 15 and 16). The last as follows: Addictos supplicio, et pro criminum immanitate damnatos. nulli Clericorum vel Monachorum — per vim atque usurpationem vindicare liceat ac tenere. Quibus in causa criminali humanitatis consideratione, si tempora suffragantur, interponendæ provocationis copiam non negamus. — Reos tempore provocationis emenso ad locum pœnæ sub prosecutione porgentes, nullus aut teneat aut defendat. Si

lum, with which the Heathen temples had been invested [9] All these rights had grown naturally out of the old ecclesiastical notions, long before the emperors began to give them severally the sanction of laws.[10]

At the same time the possessions of the church were very much enlarged, as well through the liberality of the emperors as by the liberty now granted them of accepting inheritances and gifts, — a liberty but too often abused.[11] All these advantages and privileges induced many to enter the church from mercenary motives, and this swelled the number of the clergy beyond all account; new classes being added to those already existing (*parabolani copiatæ*).[12] The emperors were

---

tanta Clericorum ac Monachorum audacia est, ut bellum potius quam judicium futurum esse existimetur, ad Clementiam Nostram commissa referantur. ut nostro mox severior ultio procedat arbitrio. Ad Episcoporum sane culpam redundabit, si quid forte in ea parte regionis, in qua ipsi populo Christianæ Religionis, doctrinæ insinuatione, moderantur, ex his, quæ fieri hac lege prohibemus, a Monachis perpetratum esse cognoverint, nec vindicaverint.

[9] At first this was only a custom, (Examples *Ammian. Marcell. XXVI.* 3. *Zosimus IV.* 40. *V.* 8. *Gregor. Naz. orat. XX. in laudem Basilii, Opp. T.* 1. *p.* 353, etc.), which is referred to as already in existence in the restrictive laws of Theodosius and Arcadius (*Cod. Theod.* IX. 45, I – 3, and formally confirmed and defined by Theodosius II. A. D. 431 (*ibid. L.* 4). See *Bingham Lib.* VIII c. 11. vol. III. p. 353 seq. (Abele) Magazin für Kirchenrecht u. Kirchengesch. St. 1. (Leip. 1778. 8vo.) S. 189 ff.

[10] So *Constantini Lex* A. D. 329 (*Cod. Justin.* I. 4, 25): Quæ de alea, sive ut vocant cottis, ac de eorum prohibitione a nobis sancita sunt, ea liceat Dei amicissimis Episcopis et perscrutari, et cohibere, si fiant, et flagitiosos per clarissimos Præsides provinciarum, et Patres defensoresque civitatum ad modestiam reducere. *Honorii* A. D. 408 (*Cod. Theod.* XVI. 10, 19) in reference to every kind of idolatry: Episcopis quoque locorum hæc ipsa prohibendi Ecclesiasticæ manus tribuimus facultatem. A. D. 409 (*Cod. Theod.* IX. 3, 7), after having admonished the judges to treat prisoners humanely: Nec deerit Antistitum Christianæ religionis cura laudabilis, quæ ad observationem constituti Judicis hanc ingerat monitionem. cf. *Cod. Theod.* V. 5, 2. V. 7, 2. XV. 8, 2. cf. *C. W. de Rhoer dissertt. de effectu religionis Christ. in jurisprudentiam Rom. (Fasc. I. Groningæ.* 1776. 8vo.) p. 94 seq.

[11] *Valentiniani lex* A. D. 370 *ad Damasum Episc. Urbis Rom.* (Cod. Theod. XVI. 2, 20): Ecclesiastici, aut ex Ecclesiasticis, vel qui continentium se volunt nomine nuncupari, viduarum ac pupillarum domos non adeant: sed publicis exterminentur judiciis, si posthac eos adfines earum vel propinqui putaverint deferendos. Censemus etiam, ut memorati nihil de ejus mulieris, cui se privatim sub prætextu religionis adjunxerint, liberalitate quacunque, vel extremo judicio possint adipisci, et omne in tantum inefficax sit, quod alicui horum ab his fuerit derelictum, ut nec per subjectam personam valeant aliquid, vel donatione vel testamento, percipere, etc. On this subject *Hieronymus Epist.* 34 (*al.* 2) *ad Nepotianum*: Nec de lege conqueror, sed doleo, cur meruerimus hanc legem. — Cauterium bonum est, sed quo mihi vulnus, ut indigeam cauterio? Provida severaque legis cautio, et tamen nec sic refrænatur avaritia. Comp. the laws of Theodosius II. *l. c. L.* 27 and 28.

[12] In the work entitled *De Septem Ordinibus Ecclesiæ*, ascribed to Hieron. (Hier. opp. ed. Martian T. V. p. 100), the copiatæ are mentioned under the name of *fossarii*, as the lowest order of the clergy. A law of Theodosius II. A. D. 416 (Cod. Theod. XVI. 2, 42) provides that there shall not be more than 500 parabolani in Alexandria. In the year 418 (ibid. L. 43), a greater number are allowed. The same emperor reduced the number of copiatæ in Constantinople from 1100 to 950 (Cod. Just. I. 2, 4).

forced, at last, for the safety of the state, to remedy this abuse by especial laws.[13]

These circumstances contributed more particularly to increase the consequence of the bishops. At the head of a numerous and servile clergy, they had the whole management of the church estates, and by means of the synods, where they alone had a voice, they could establish whatever ecclesiastical laws they saw fit. By the abolition of the country bishoprics, the only check was taken from their power;[14] for, from this time, the affairs of each separate church (*παροικία, plebs, titulus, ecclesia plebana*—opposed to the *ecclesia cathedralis,*) were administered by a presbyter (*parochus, plebanus*),[15] who was appointed by the bishop, and wholly dependent on him; the bishop receiving all the revenues, and allowing the presbyter a certain sum for his support. From the end of the fourth century the Archdeacon[16] was next to the bishop in rank, his duty being to assist him in the management of the church revenues. The Archpresbyters,[17] an order of clergy appointed at nearly the same time, were of very inferior rank. All the lower clergy, like the presbyters, were chosen by the bishop. The bishop himself was chosen chiefly by the other bishops of the province, except when the emperors interfered. Still, however, the consent of the people was required, and in the West, especially, was not without weight.[18]

Under these circumstances it is not surprising that the prevailing notions of clerical dignity were much elevated; and especially with regard to the bishops, whose claims, as the representatives of Christ and the successors of the Apostles, were capable of being indefinitely extended. Nor is it wonderful that they were treated with the great-

---

[13] Constantine passed a law to this effect before A. D. 320 (Cod. Theod. XVI. 2, 3): Nullum deinceps Decurionem, vel ex Decurione progenitum, vel etiam instructum idoneis facultatibus, atque obeundis publicis muneribus opportunum, ad Clericorum nomen obsequiumque confugere: sed eos de cetero in defunctorum duntaxat Clericorum loca subrogari, qui fortuna tenues, neque muneribus civilibus teneantur obstricti. These provisions are often repeated.

[14] *Cf. Conc. Ancyr. can.* 13. *Conc. Antioch. ann.* 341. *can.* 10. *Conc. Laodiceni* (between A. D. 320 and 372). Can. 57: *ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἐν ταῖς κώμαις, καὶ ἐν ταῖς χώραις καθίστασθαι ἐπισκόπους, ἢ ἀλλὰ περιοδευτάς· τοὺς μέντοι ἤδη προκαταστάθεντας μηδὲν πράττειν ἄνευ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τοῦ ἐν τῇ πόλει· ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους μηδὲν πράττειν ἄνευ τῆς γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου.* The intent of this canon was probably not to do away with the country bishops altogether, but only to prevent the establishment of new bishoprics. We find mention of country bishops long after this. Basil the Great had fifty in his diocese (Greg. Naz. de vita sua, p. 8). Theodoret. Ep. 113 names two of his own suburbans, etc.

[15] *Thomassini vetus et nova eccles. discipl. P.* I. *Lib.* 2. *c.* 21 *seq. Bingham Lib.* IX. *c.* 8. *vol.* III. *p.* 590.

[16] *Thomassini P.* I. *Lib.* 2. *c.* 17. *Bingham Lib.* II. *c.* 21. *vol.* I. *p.* 338. J. G. Pertsch Abhandl. v. d. Ursprunge d. Archidiaconen &c. Hildesheim. 1743. 8vo.

[17] *Thomassini P.* I. *Lib.* 2. *c.* 3. *Bingham Lib.* II. *c.* 19. § 18. *vol.* I. *p.* 301.

[18] *Thomassini P.* II. *lib.* 2. *c.* 2 and 3. *Leo* epist. 10. c. 3: Qui præfuturus est omnibus, ab omnibus eligatur.

est external deference,[19] though their overweening pride often gave just cause of complaint.[20]

§ 90.

DEPENDENCE OF THE HIERARCHY ON THE STATE.

With all these outward marks of respect and honor, however, the clergy were by no means independent of the power of the state;[1] especially as the government of the Roman emperors had assumed a character of Oriental despotism, ever since the removal of their residence to the East.[2]

The first occasion of interference, however, was offered by the hierarchy itself, in the constant and unbroken series of controversies in which it was involved.[3] The emperors were to tolerate only the Catholic and true church;[4] and as this name was claimed by so many

---

19 Concerning the dignity of the priests, and especially of the bishops, see *Constitt. Apost.* II. c. 26 *seq.* especially *cap.* 34: ὅσῳ τοίνυν ψυχὴ σώματος κρείττων, τοσούτῳ ἱερωσύνη βασιλείας· διαμένει γὰρ αὐτὴ καὶ λύει τοὺς τιμωρίας ἢ ἀφέσεως ἀξίους· διὸ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον στέργειν ὀφείλετε ὡς πατέρα, φοβεῖσθαι ὡς βασιλέα, τιμᾶν ὡς κύριον. The important assertion that the priesthood was above the crown is found also in *Chrysostomus Homil.* 4, *de verbis Isaiæ*, *De Sacerdotio* III, *c.* 1. *Homil.* 15, *in Epist.* II. *ad Corinth. Comp. Gregor. Naz.* in note 5. Amongst the marks of reverence paid them by the emperors were ὑποκλίνειν κεφαλὴν and καταφιλεῖν τὰς χεῖρας, vid. *Bingham Lib.* II. *c.* 9. *vol.* I. *p.* 134. Eusebia, wife of the emperor Constantius, having omitted these in receiving the salutations of the bishops, the bishop of Tripoli, *Leontius*, declared to her (*Philostorgius ap. Suidam. s. v.* Λεόντιος) that he would appear before her only on the following conditions: ἵν' εἰσέλθοιμι μὲν ἐγώ, σύ δ' αὐτίκα τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ ὑψηλοῦ κατάβασα, μετ' αἰδοῦς ὑπαντήσειας ἐμοὶ, καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ὑπόσχης ταῖς ἐμαῖς χερσὶν, εὐλογιῶν ἀξιουμένη· κἄπειτα καθεσθείην μὲν ἄν ἐγὼ, σὺ δ' ἂν ἑστήκοις αἰδουμένη, ὁπόταν δὲ κελεύσαιμι, καθεδουμένη, ἡνίκα δοίην τὸ σύνθημα. Εἰ οὕτως αἰρήσῃ, ἀφικοίμην παρά σε, κ. τ. λ. Comp. the conduct of the bishop Martinus at the court of Maximus. At table the emperor commanded the cup to be first offered to him (*Sulp. Severus de vita Mart. c.* 20), exspectans atque ambiens, ut ab illius dextera poculum sumeret. Sed Martinus ubi ebibit, pateram presbytero suo tradidit, nullum scilicet existimans digniorem, qui post se biberet. At another time the empress waited on him at table (*Sulp. Severi dial.* II. 6). Comp. generally, Chrysostomus de sacerdotio. The work *De dignitate sacerdotali* found in the writings of Ambrose is not by him, but by Gerbert (Sylvester II. about 1000) vid. *Mabillon Analecta*, p. 102.

20 *Hieronym. ad Tit. c.* 1: De episcopatu intumescunt, et putant se non dispensationem Christi sed imperium consecutos. — Sciat episcopus et presbyter sibi populum conservum esse, non servum.

1 *Socrates Lib.* IV. *Proœm.* ἀφ' οὗ χριστιανίζειν ἤρξαντο (οἱ βασιλεῖς, τὰ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας πράγματα ἤρτητο ἐξ αὐτῶν, καὶ αἱ μέγισται Σύνοδοι τῇ αὐτῶν γνώμῃ γεγόνασί τε καὶ γίνονται.

2 *C W. De Rhoer dissertt. de effectu Relig. Christ. in jurisprudentiam Romanam p.* 40 seq.

3 The first instance of an appeal to the imperial authority was by the Donatists. See § 69.

4 Constantine's law A. D. 326 (*Cod. Theod.* XVI. 5, 1): Privilegia, quæ contemplatione religionis indulta sunt, catholicæ tantum legis observatoribus pro-

parties exclusively, they were obliged to determine to whom it belonged.[5] To this end they summoned council after council, under the superintendence of their commissioners,[6] and gave the imperial sanction to their decrees.[7] When, however, this did not end the controversy, (which was commonly the case), the emperors, prompted, as it might happen, by political or religious motives, and sometimes influenced by court-cabals, came in with new decisions, either taking a middle course, or declaring in favor of those who had before been condemned. On such occasions the favored party could not but think the interference of the state most profitable for the church.[8] It was only the discomfited who maintained that its affairs were subject to the bishops alone, and not to the emperors.[9]

---

desse oportet. Hæreticos autem, atque schismaticos non tantum ab his privilegiis alienos esse volumus, sed etiam diversis muneribus constringi et subjici.

[5] Comp. the law of Theodosius I. A. D. 380. *Cod. Theod.* XVI. 1, 2. See above, § 81, note 21.

[6] *Eusebius de vita Const.* I. 44: ἐξαίρετον τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ νέμων φροντίδα, διαφερομένων τινῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους κατὰ διαφόρους χώρας, οἷά τις κοινὸς ἐπίσκοπος ἐκ θεοῦ καθεσταμένος, συνόδους τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ λειτουργῶν συνεκρότει. *Constant. Epist. ad Syn. Tyriam* (*ibid.* IV. 42) ἀπέστειλα πρὸς οὓς ἐβουλήθητε τῶν ἐπισκόπων, ἵνα παραγενόμενοι, κοινωνήσωσιν ὑμῖν τῶν φροντισμάτων· ἀπέστειλα Διονύσιον τὸν ἀπὸ ὑπατικῶν, ὃς καὶ τοὺς ὀφείλοντας εἰς τὴν σύνοδον ἀφικέσθαι μεθ' ὑμῶν ὑπομνήσει, καὶ τῶν πραττομένων, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ τῆς εὐταξίας κατάσκοπος παρόσται· ἐὰν γάρ τις, ὡς ἐγὼ οὐκ οἶομαι, τὴν ἡμετέραν κέλευσιν καὶ νῦν διακρούσασθαι πειρώμενος, μὴ βουληθῇ παραγενέσθαι, ἐντεῦθεν παρ' ἡμῶν ἀποσταλήσεται, ὃς ἐκ βασιλικοῦ προστάγματος αὐτὸν ἐκβαλὼν, ὡς οὐ προσήκεν ὅροις αὐτοκράτορος ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐξενεχθεῖσιν ἀντιτείνειν, διδάξει. The emperor empowered the tribune Marcellinus to decide the controversy between the Catholics and Donatists in Africa A. D 411. See *Gesta Collationis Carthaginensis diei* I. c. 4 (annexed to *Optatus Milev. ed. Du Pin, p.* 247): Cui quidem disputationi principe loco te judicem volumus residere, omnemque vel in congregandis Episcopis, vel evocandis, si adesse contemserint, curam te volumus sustinere, ut et ea, quæ ante mandata sunt, et quæ nunc statuta cognoscis, probata possis implere solertia: id ante omnia servaturus, ut ea quæ circa Catholicam legem vel olim ordinavit antiquitas, vel parentum nostrorum auctoritas religiosa constituit, vel nostra serenitas roboravit, novella subreptione submota, integra et inviolata custodias. Comp. Fuch's Bibl. der Kirchenversammlungen, Th. 3. S. 166.

[7] *Epist. Conc.* II. œcumen. (*Constantinop. ann.* 381) *ad Theodosium Imp.* (*Mansi* III. *p.* 557): διόρμεθα τοίνυν τῆς σῆς ἡμερότητος γράμματι τῆς σῆς εὐσεβείας ἐπικυρωθῆναι τῆς συνόδου τὸν ψῆφον· ἵν' ὥσπερ τοῖς τῆς κλήσεως γράμμασι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τετίμηκας, οὕτω καὶ τῶν δοξάντων ἐπισφραγίσῃς τὸ τέλος. *cf. de Marca de concord. Sac. et. Imp. Lib.* II. c. 10. § 10 seq. *Lib.* VI. c. 22.

[8] The Donatists, who rejected the imperial decision with the words (*Optatus Milev.* I. 22): Quid Christianis cum Regibus? aut quid Episcopis cum palatio? (*ibid.* III. 3) quid est Imperatori cum Ecclesia? are answered by Optatus (l. c.): Non Respublica est in Ecclesia, sed Ecclesia in Republica est i. e. in Imperio Romano. — Cum super Imperatorem non sit nisi solus Deus, qui fecit Imperatorem, dum se Donatus super Imperatorem extollit, jam quasi hominum excesserat metas, ut prope se Deum, non hominem æstimaret, non reverendo eum, qui post Deum ab hominibus timebatur.

[9] *Hosii Epist. ad Constantium* (in *Athanasii hist. Arianorum ad Monachos* c. 44): μὴ οἴθι σεαυτὸν εἰς τὰ ἐκκλησιαστικὰ, μηδὲ συ περὶ τούτων ἡμῖν παρακελεύου· ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον παρ' ἡμῶν συ μάνθανε ταῦτα. σοὶ βασιλείαν ὁ θεὸς ἐνεχείρισεν, ἡμῖν τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπίστευσε. καὶ, ὥσπερ ὁ τὴν σὴν ἀρχὴν ὑποκλίπτων ἀντιλέγει τῷ διαταξαμένῳ θεῷ· οὕτω φοβήθητι, μὴ καὶ σὺ τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἕλκων ὑπεύθυνος ἐγκλήματι

Besides these great party-questions, the interference of the emperors was often solicited by the clergy in their private affairs: notwithstanding that such applications were soon forbidden by the councils.[10] For though the clergy were anxious to shake off all dependence on the other authorities of the state,[11] they still acknowledged the decision of the emperor to be the highest appeal: so much so, that the Roman bishop considered it a great distinction that he could be judged by none other than the emperor himself.[12] The supreme authority of the emperor was never called in question, so long as the rights of conscience were not invaded,[13] and the imperial laws, when they extend-

---

μεγάλῳ γένῃ. So too *Athanasius lib. cit.* in various passages. Leontius, bishop of Tripoli, said to Constantius (*Suidas* s. v. Λεόντιος): Θαυμάζω, ὅπως ἕτερα διέπειν ταχθεὶς, ἑτέροις ἐπιχειρεῖς, στρατιωτικῶν μὲν καὶ πολιτικῶν πραγμάτων προεστηκώς, Ἐπισκόποις δὲ περὶ τῶν εἰς μόνους Ἐπισκόπους ἡκόντων διαπαττόμενος.

[10] *Conc. Antioch. ann.* 341 *can.* 12: Εἴ τις ὑπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου Ἐπισκόπου καθαιρεθεὶς πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, ἢ καὶ Ἐπίσκοπος ὑπὸ συνόδου, ἐνοχλήσαι τολμήσειε τὰς βασιλίδας ἀκοὰς, δέον ἐπὶ μείζονα Ἐπισκόπων σύνοδον τρέπεσθαι· — τούτον μηδεμιᾶς συγγνώμης ἀξιοῦσθαι, μηδὲ χώραν ἀπολογίας ἔχειν, μηδὲ ἐλπίδα ἀποκαταστάσεως προσδοκᾶν. This is repeated by the *Conc. Constantin. ann.* 381, *c.* 6. — *Conc. Antioch. c.* 11, forbids all the clergy to go to the imperial presence ἄνευ γνώμης καὶ γραμμάτων τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ ἐπισκόπων, καὶ μάλιστα τοῦ κατὰ τὴν μητρόπολιν. *Con. Sardic. can. latinus* 8 (*græc.* 7): Quidam non cessant ad comitatum ire Episcopi, et maxime Afri: — ut non solum ad comitatum multas et diversas ecclesiæ non profuturas perferant causas, neque ut fieri solet aut oportet, ut pauperibus, aut viduis, aut pupillis subveniatur; sed et dignitates sæculares et administrationes quibusdam postulent. Hæc itaque pravitas olim non solum murmurationes, sed et scandala excitavit. Honestum est autem, ut Episcopi intercessionem his præstent, qui iniqua vi opprimuntur, aut si vidua affligatur, aut pupillus exspolietur: si tamen ista omnia justam habeant causam, aut petitionem. Si ergo vobis, fratres carissimi, placet, decernite, ne Episcopi ad comitatum accedant, nisi forte hi, qui religiosi Imperatoris literis vel invitati, vel evocati fuerint. — Universi dixerunt: Placet, et constituatur.

[11] *Conc. Carthag. III. ann.* 397, *c.* 9: Item placuit, ut quisquis Episcoporum, Presbyterorum et Diaconorum seu Clericorum, cum in ecclesia ei crimen fuerit intentatum, vel civilis causa fuerit commota, si relicto ecclesiastico judicio, publicis judiciis purgari voluerit, etiam si pro ipso fuerit prolata sententia, locum suum amittat, et hoc in criminali judicio. In civili vero perdat quod evicit, si locum suum obtinere voluerit. Cui enim ad eligendos judices undique patet auctoritas, ipse se indignum fraterno consortio judicat, qui de universa ecclesia male sentiendo, de judicio sæculari poscit auxilium, cum privatorum Christianorum causas Apostolus ad ecclesiam deferri, atque ibi determinari præcipiat. — *Conc. Chalced. c.* 9: Εἴ τις κληρικὸς πρὸς κληρικὸν πρᾶγμα ἔχει, μὴ καταλιμπανέτω τὸν οἰκεῖον ἐπίσκοπον, καὶ ἐπὶ κοσμικὰ δικαστήρια κατατρεχέτω. — εἰ δέ τις παρὰ ταῦτα ποιήσει, κανονικοῖς ὑποκείσθω ἐπιτιμίοις.

[12] *Epistola Rom. Concilii ad Gratianum et Valentinianum Impp.* A. D. 378 (in *J. Sirmondi Append. Cod. Theodos. p.* 78, and in *Coustant* amongst the *Damasi Epistt. no.* 6): Accipite aliud quoque, quod vir sanctus (Damasus) vestræ magis conferre pietati, quam sibi præstare desiderat, nec derogare cuiquam, sed principibus adrogare; quoniam non novum aliquid petit, sed sequitur exempla majorum: ut Episcopus Romanus, si concilio ejus causa non creditur, apud concilium se Imperiale defendat. Nam et Sylvester Papa a sacrilegis accusatus, apud parentem vestrum Constantinum causam propriam prosecutus est. Et de scripturis similia exempla suppeditant: quod cum a præside sanctus Apostolus vim pateretur, Cæsarem appellavit, et ad Cæsarem missus est.

[13] See *Optatus* note 8, above. *Ambrosius Apolog. David. c.* 10: Nullis David legibus tenebatur, quia liberi sunt Reges a vinculis delictorum, nec enim ullis ad pœnam vocantur legibus, tuti Imperii Majestate.

ed to the church, were received by the bishops with implicit obedience.[14]

The influence of the emperor in the election of all the more important bishops, and the power which he sometimes exercised, of appointing and deposing them at pleasure,[15] naturally secured to him the obedience of the clergy, and thus the supreme direction of ecclesiastical affairs. The exact relations of the civil and ecclesiastical power were not, as yet, strictly defined.[16]

§ 91.

APPOINTMENT OF PATRIARCHS, ESPECIALLY IN THE EAST.

Traité historique de la Primauté en l'église par *D. Blondel.* Genève. 1641. fol. — *Jo. Morini* exercitatt. ecclesiasticæ et biblicæ. Paris. 1669. fol. (diss. I. de Patriarchum et Primatum origine). — *L. E. Du Pin* de antiqua eccles. disciplina dissertt. Paris. 1686. 4to. Diss. I. — *L. Thomassini* vetus et nova ecclesiæ disciplina. Lib. I. cap. 7–20. — *Bingham* origg. eccl. lib. II. cap. 17. — *J. W. Janus* de origine Patriarcharum Christianorum diss. II. Viteb. 1718. 4to. W. C. L. Ziegler's pragm. Gesch. der kirchl. Verfassungsformen in den ersten sechs Jahrh. Leipzig. 1798. 8vo. S. 164 ff. — Planck's Gesch. d. christl. Gesellschaftsverfassung, Bd. 1. S. 598 ff.

In the last period we have already seen that the three great metropilitans of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch were distinguished from the other metropolitans, as presiding over several provinces at once. This state of things was discussed at the council of Nice, probably on occasion of the Meletian schism in Egypt, and approved in can. VI. of that council.[1] At the same time the provincial synods were de-

---

[14] The law *Cod. Theod.* XVI. 2, 20, *ad Damasum Episc. Urbis Rom.* (see § 89. noté 11) is marked as: lecta in ecclesiis Rom. (comp. the evasive remarks of *Baronius ann.* 370 *no.* 123). *Gothofredus ad h. l.* gives various examples of the reading of the imperial laws in the churches.

[15] *Thomassini vetus et nova Eccl. discipl. P. II. Lib.* 2, *c.* 6, especially in Constantinople.

[16] *Eusebius de vita Const.* IV. 24, often speaking of the activity of Constantine in suppressing paganism, relates the following: *Ἔνθεν εἰκότως αὐτὸς ἐν ἱστιάσει ποτὲ δεξιούμενος ἐπισκόπους, λόγον ἀφῆκεν, ὡς ἄρα εἴη καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπίσκοπος. ὧδέ πη αὐτοῖς εἰπὼν ῥήμασιν ἐφ' ἡμετέραις ἀκοαῖς· "ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς μὲν τῶν εἴσω τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν ἐκτὸς ὑπὸ θεοῦ καθεσταμένος ἐπίσκοπος ἂν εἴην." ἀκόλουθα δ' οὖν τῷ λόγῳ διανοούμενος, τοὺς ἀρχομένους ἅπαντας ἐπεισκόπει προὔτρεπέ τε ὅση περ ἂν ἡ δύναμις τὸν εὐσεβῆ μεταδιώκειν βίον.* On the different explanation of these words of Constantine, vid. *Ch. D. F. Walch, de τοῖς εἴσω τῆς ἐκκλησίας et τοῖς ἐκτὸς Constantini M.* in the *Commentationes Soc. Gottingensis, vol.* VI. *p.* 81 *seq.* The context shows that Constantine did not mean *τὰ ἐκτός*, but *τοὺς ἐκτός*. See the translation of Eusebius by *F. A. Stroth.* Bd. 2. S. 410. Anmerkung.

[1] *Can. Nic.* VI: *τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω, τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πεντα-πόλει, ὥστε τὸν* 'Αλεξανδρείας *ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν· ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ* 'Ρώμῃ *ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο σύνηθές ἐστιν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν* 'Αντιόχειαν, *καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις τὰ πρεσβεῖα σώζεσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. Καθόλου δὲ πρόδηλον ἐκεῖνο, ὅτι εἴ τις χωρὶς γνώμης τοῦ μητροπολίτου γένοιτο ἐπίσκοπος, τὸν τοιοῦτον ἡ μεγάλη*

clared to be the highest ecclesiastical authority.[2] But, during the endless struggles of the Arian controversy, which now ensued, the provincial synods proved too weak to maintain their authority against opponents who were often supported by the power of the state. The bishops were thus induced to form wider combinations, by which they might individually be made more secure. This new developement of the hierarchy, however, proceeded on different principles in the two parts of the Roman empire.

In the *East* the divisions of the provinces had, from the first, been followed in the arrangement of their metropolitan government, and this principle of distribution had become more and more fixed by custom.[3] In the formation of larger hierarchical combinations, therefore, they naturally adhered to the political distribution of the realm

---

σύνοδος ὥρισε μὴ δεῖν εἶναι ἐπίσκοπον. The Greek writers *(Johannes Scholasticus*, about A. D. 564. *Theodore Balsamon. Johannes Zonaras)* understand this as a confirmation of the patriarchates. In the oldest Roman Codex cann. to which the Roman legates appealed as early as the Concil. Chalced. *(Actio* XVI. *Mansi* VII. *p.* 444), (ed. by *Mansi* VI. *p.* 1186 comp. Labbei observ. *Mansi* II. *p.* 688) the canon runs thus: Ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum. Teneat autem et Ægyptus, Libya et Pantapolis, ita ut episcopus Alexandriæ harum omnium habeat potestatem: quoniam et Romano episcopo hæc est consuetudo, etc. But in the Prisca, which dates very soon after the council of Chalcedon *Prisca (Mansi* VI. p. 1127): Antiqui moris est, ut urbis Romæ Episcopus habeat principatum, ut suburbicaria loca et omnem provinciam suam sollicitudine gubernet. Quæ vero apud Ægyptum sunt, Alexandriæ Episcopus omnium habeat sollicitudinem: Similiter autem et circa Antiochiam, et in cæteris provinciis privilegia propria serventur metropolitanis ecclesiis, etc. *Nicolaus* I. (A. D. 863) *Ep.* VIII. *ad Michaelem Imp.* (*Mansi* XV. p. 206) translates the canon thus: Denique si instituta Nicænæ synodi diligenter inspiciantur, invenietur profecto, quia Romanæ Ecclesiæ nullum eadem Synodus contulit incrementum: sed potius ex ejus forma, quod Alexandrinæ Ecclesiæ tribueret particulariter, sumpsit exemplum. On the other hand, *Bellarminus de Romano Pontifice* lib. II. c. 13: Alexandrinum debere gubernare illas provincias, quia Romanus Episcopus ita consuevit, id est, quia Romanus Episcopus ante omnem Conciliorum definitionem consuevit permittere Episcopo Alexandrino regimen Ægypti, Libyæ et Pentapolis, sive consuevit per Alexandrinum Episcopum illas provincias gubernare. In later times the question has been only whether patriarchal rights (so *Sirmond*, *Em. Schelstrate*, *Natalis Alexander*, etc.) or metropolitan (so *J. Launoy*, *Sam. Basnage*, etc.) are spoken of. For the numerous works on this subject, see *Sagittarianæ introduct.* in hist. eccl. T. II. cur. *J. A. Schmid*, p. 1224 seq.

[2] *Can. Nic.* 4, confirms to the provincial synods their influence in episcopal elections. *can.* 5, recognses their authority as without appeal in cases of excommunication. *Conc. Antioch. ann.* 341 *c.* 15: *Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἐπί τισιν ἐγκλήμασιν κατηγορηθείς, κριθείη ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ ἐπισκόπων, πάντες τε σύμφωνοι μίαν κατ' αὐτοῦ ἐξενέγκοιεν ψῆφον· τοῦτον μηκέτι παρ' ἑτέροις δικάζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ μένειν βεβαίαν τὴν σύμφωνον τῶν ἐπὶ ἐπαρχίας ἐπισκόπων ἀπόφασιν.* In case of division amongst the Provincial bishops, the Metropolitan is empowered, by can. 14, to summon bishops from the neighbouring province.

[3] Cf. *Conc. Antiochen. can.* 9 see above, § 66, note 2. When Cappadocia was divided into two provinces A. D. 371, Basil was disposed to resist the application of this principle, in opposition to the bishop of Tyana, *Gregor. Naz. orat.* XLIII. c. 58 (ed. Colon Orat. XX. p. 355) Ullmanns Gregorius v. Naz. S. 118 ff.: but the *Conc. Chalcedon.* decreed *can.* 17: — *εἰ δέ τις ἐκ βασιλικῆς ἐξουσίας ἐκαινίσθη πολις, ἢ αὖθις καινισθείη, τοῖς πολιτικοῖς καὶ δημοσίοις τύποις καὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν παροικιῶν ἡ τάξις ἀκολουθείτω.* See note 12.

into dioceses which had been made by Constantine.[4] The bishops of each diocese now became more closely connected with each other; the bishop of the chief city of the diocese being at their head, and thus distinguished from the other metropolitans. The rights of this chief bishop were determined by the previous customs of each province, and therefore were different in different cases. In Egypt, the bishop of Alexandria exercised an almost monarchical sway:[5] further east, the power of the bishop of Antioch was much less;[6] and less still that of the bishop of Ephesus in the Asiatic diocese, and of the bishop of Cæsarea Cappodociæ in the diocese of Pontus. In the Thracian diocese, Constantinople had become the chief city of the province, instead of Heraclea, and as it was at the same time the chief city of the empire, the power of the bishop of Constantinople, supported by the imperial authority, and backed by the numerous bishops who were always assembled at court, (σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα),[7] soon extended itself far beyond the actual limits of the diocese. The precise extent of this power depended always on the personal character of the reigning bishop. Such was the state of things at the time of the second œcumenical council (381). This council approved of these associations amongst the bishops (can. 2.), permitted an appeal from the provincial synods to the synod of the diocese (can. 6.), and gave the bishop of Constantinople an exalted rank, second only to the bishop of Rome (can. 3.).[8]

---

[4] *Zosimus* II. 33, *Notitia dignitatum utriusque imperii*, written probably in the reign of Theodosius II (cum G. Panzirolli comm. in Grævii thes. antiquitt. Roman. vol. VII. p. 1309 seq.). I. Præfectura Orientis, 1. *Diœcesis Orientis* (Antioch), 2. *Ægypti* (Alexandria), 3. *Asiæ* (Ephesus), 4. *Ponti* (Cæsarea Cappod.), 5. *Thraciæ* (Heraclea, then Constantinople). II. Præf. Illyrici Orientalis, from A. D. 379 separated from the West, together with the Hypst. Thessalonica, 1. *Diœc. Macedoniæ*, 2. *Daciæ*. III. Præf. Italiæ, 1. *Diœc. Romæ* (Rome), 2. *Italiæ* (Mediolanum), 3. *Illyrici occidentalis* (Sirmium), 4. *Africæ* (Carthage). IV. Præf. Galliarum, 1. *Diœc. Galliæ* (Augusta Trevirorum), 2. *Hispaniæ*, 3. *Britanniæ*. Over the Prefectures were placed Præfecti Prætorio; over the Dioceses, or Vicariates, Vicarii; over the Provinces, Rectores with different titles, consulares, correctores, usually præsides.

[5] *Epiphanius hær.* 68, § 1: Τοῦτο γὰρ ἔθος ἐστί, τὸν ἐν τῇ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ Ἀρχιεπίσκοπον πάσης τε Αἰγύπτου καὶ Θηβαΐδος, Μαραιώτου τε καὶ Λιβύης, Ἀμμονιακῆς Μαραιώτιδός τε καὶ Πεντηπόλεως ἔχειν τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν διοίκησιν.

[6] *Hieronymi* ad Pammachium contra errores Joann. Hierosol. (A. D. 397) c. 15: Tu qui regulas quæris ecclesiasticas, et Nicæni concilii canonibus uteris: — responde mihi: ad Alexandrinum episcopum Palæstina quid pertinet? Ni fallor, hoc ibi decernitur, ut Palæstinæ Metropolis Cæsarea sit, et totius Orientis Antiochia. Aut igitur ad Cæsariensem episcopum referre debueras — aut si procul expetendum judicium erat, Antiochiam potius literæ dirigendæ.

[7] *Anatolius*, bishop of Constantinople, says, at the council of Chalcedon, *Actio* IV. (*Mansi* VII. p. 92): συνήθεια ἄνωθεν κεκράτηκε, τοὺς ἐνδημοῦντας τῇ μεγαλωνύμῳ πόλει ἁγιωτάτους ἐπισκόπους, ἡνίκα καιρὸς καλίσῃ, περὶ ἀνακυττόντων τινῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πραγμάτων συνεῖναι, καὶ διατυποῦν ἕκαστα, καὶ ἀποκρίσεως ἀξιοῦν τοὺς δεομένους.

[8] *Canon* II: Τοὺς ὑπὲρ διοίκησιν ἐπισκόπους ταῖς ὑπερορίοις ἐκκλησίαις μὴ ἐπιέναι, μηδὲ συγχέειν τὰς ἐκκλησίας· ἀλλὰ κατὰ τοὺς κανόνας τὸν μὲν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ μόνον οἰκονομεῖν· τοὺς δὲ τῆς Ἀνατολῆς ἐπισκόπους τὴν Ἀνατολὴν μόνην διοικεῖν, φυλαττομένων τῶν ἐν τοῖς κανόσι τοῖς κατὰ Νικαίαν πρεσβείων τῇ Ἀντιοχέων ἐκκλησίᾳ·

Thus in the East the bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Ephesus, and Cæsarea became conspicuous amongst the Metropolitans by the authority they had acquired over the other bishops of the same political dioceses. They were now designated by the peculiar titles of Ἔξαρχοι, Ἀρχιεπίσκοποι;[9] and shortly before the council of Chalcedon the title of Πατριάρχης[10] was appropriated to them exclusively. But the ambition of individuals soon led to new changes. Not contented with the diocese of Thrace, the bishops of Constantinople encroached on the neighbouring dioceses of Asia and Pontus.[11] At first they met with some resistance, but at the council of Chalcedon they were formally invested with the superintendence over all three dioceses (can. 28.).[12] Thus the exarchs of Ephesus and Cæsarea ceased to be numbered in the highest class of hierarchs. The bishops

---

καὶ τοὺς τῆς Ἀσιανῆς διοικήσεως ἐπισκόπους τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν μόνην οἰκονομεῖν· καὶ τοὺς τῆς Ποντικῆς τὰ τῆς Ποντικῆς μόνον· καὶ τούς τῆς Θράκης τὰ τῆς Θρᾳκικῆς μόνον οἰκονομεῖν. — Φυλαττομένου δὲ τοῦ προγεγραμμένου περὶ τῶν διοικήσεων κανόνος, εὔδηλον ὡς τὰ καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν ἡ τῆς ἐπαρχίας σύνοδος διοικήσει κατὰ τὰ ἐν Νικαίᾳ ὡρισμένα. *Can.* III: Τὸν μέντοι Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον ἔχειν τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς μετὰ τὸν τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπίσκοπον, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν νέαν Ῥώμην. (cf. *P. de Marca* de Constantinopolitani Patriarchatus institutione in Bohmers Ausg. p. 155—204). *Can.* VI: — εἰ δὲ συμβαίη ἀδυνατῆσαι τοὺς ἐπαρχιώτας πρὸς διόρθωσιν τῶν ἐπιφερομένων ἐγκλημάτων τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, τότε αὐτοὺς προσείναι μείζονι συνόδῳ τῶν τῆς διοικήσεως ἐπισκόπων ἐκείνης, ὑπὲρ τῆς αἰτίας ταύτης συγκαλουμένων.

[9] According to Canon Sardic. VI. every Metropolitan is ὁ ἔξαρχος τῆς ἐπαρχίας. On the other hand, just before the Council of Chalcedon, the bishop of Antioch is called ὁ ἔξαρχος τῆς ἀνατολικῆς διοικήσεως (Conc. Chalcedon. actio XIV.). — The title Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος is first applied to the bishop of Alexandria by Athanas apol. II. Epiphan. hær. 68. In the acts of the first Council of Ephesus it is very frequently given to the bishops of Rome and Alexandria.

[10] In the 4th century this title was given to all bishops indiscriminately. *Gregor. Nazianz.* orat. 20, 32, 41. *Gregor. Nyss.* orat. funebr. in Meletium. See *Suiceri* thes. eccl. T. II. p. 640 seq. — First confined to the higher bishops by *Socrates* V. 8, then *Conc. Chalced.*

[11] Comp. Ziegler, l. c. S. 184 ff.

[12] *Can. Chalced.* 28 (Actio XV. Mansi T. VII. p. 369): Πανταχοῦ τοῖς τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ὅροις ἑπόμενοι, καὶ τὸν ἀρτίως ἀναγνωσθέντα κανόνα τῶν ἰσοτίμων θεοφιλεστάτων ἐπισκόπων γνωρίζοντες, τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ἡμεῖς ὁρίζομεν, καὶ ψηφιζόμεθα περὶ τῶν πρεσβείων τῆς ἁγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, νέας Ῥώμης. Καὶ γὰρ τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης, διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην, οἱ πατέρες εἰκότως ἀποδεδώκασι, τὰ πρεσβεῖα, καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ σκοπῷ κινούμενοι οἱ ἰσοτίμεστατοι ἐπίσκοποι τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα ἀπένειμαν τῷ τῆς νέας Ῥώμης ἁγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ, εὐλόγως κρίναντες, τὴν βασιλείᾳ καὶ συγκλήτῳ τιμηθεῖσαν πόλιν καὶ τῶν ἴσων ἀπολαύουσαν πρεσβείων τῇ πρεσβυτέρᾳ βασιλίδι Ῥώμῃ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς, ὡς ἐκείνην, μεγαλύνεσθαι πράγμασι, δευτέραν μετ' ἐκείνην ὑπάρχουσαν· καὶ ὥστε τοὺς τῆς Ποντικῆς, καὶ τῆς Ἀσιανῆς, καὶ τῆς Θρᾳκικῆς διοικήσεως μητροπολίτας μόνους, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐν τοῖς βαρβαρικοῖς ἐπισκόπους τῶν προειρημένων διοικήσεων χειροτονεῖσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ προειρημένου ἁγιωτάτου θρόνου τῆς κατὰ Κωνσταντινούπολιν ἁγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας· δηλαδὴ ἑκάστου μητροπολίτου τῶν προειρημένων διοικήσεων, μετὰ τῶν τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἐπισκόπων, χειροτονοῦντος τοὺς τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἐπισκόπους, καθὼς τοῖς θείοις κανόσι δικηγόευται· χειροτονεῖσθαι δέ, καθὼς εἴρηται, τοὺς μητροπολίτας τῶν προειρημένων διοικήσεων παρὰ τοῦ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἀρχιεπισκόπου, ψηφισμάτων συμφώνων, κατὰ τὸ ἔθος, γενομένων, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἀναφερομένων. *cf. Edm. Richerii hist. concill. generall. Lib.* I. c. 8 § 37 seq. Thus the council seemed to have considered the political importance of the cities as a ground for exalting the bishops to patriarchs. Comp. note 3 above.

of Antioch, however, were foiled in a similar attempt to extend their power. For having laid claim to Cyprus, as part of the political diocese of Asia, the Cyprian bishops, by the influence of the Alexandrian party at the council of Ephesus, were declared independent. The bishops of Jerusalem, who had long been attempting in vain to shake themselves free of their Metropolitan in Cæsarea, on the ground of the precedence conceded them at the synod of Nice,[13] succeeded at length in their attempt, being raised to the grade of Patriarchs by an edict of Theodosius II., and the three Palestines assigned them for their diocese by the council at Chalcedon.[14] At the close of this period, therefore, we have in the East the Patriarchs of Constantinople, of Alexandria, of Antioch, and Jerusalem.[15] These four were looked upon each as the centre of union for his own diocese.[16] At the head of their synods they decided without appeal all the ecclesiastical affairs of the diocese; whilst they were considered as the highest representatives of the church general, through whose communications its unity was to be preserved, and without whose assent no measures affecting the interests of the whole church could be taken.[17]

Finally, the council of Chalcedon determined that an appeal might be made from the other patriarchs to the patriarch of Constantino-

---

[13] *Can. Nicæn.* VII: Ἐπειδὴ συνήθεια κεκράτηκε καὶ παράδοσις ἀρχαία, ὥστε τὸν ἐν Αἰλίᾳ ἐπίσκοπον τιμᾶσθαι, ἐχέτω τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῆς τιμῆς, τῇ μητροπόλει σωζομένου τοῦ οἰκείου ἀξιώματος compare § 66, note 9. Thus the *Concil. Constant.* A. D. 382 (*in Theodoreti hist. eccl.* V. 9) calls this church τὴν μητέρα ἁπασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τὴν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις.

[14] Ziegler, l. c. S. 240 ff.

[15] Concerning their rights see Ziegler, S. 272 ff. Planck, S. 610 ff.

[16] Thus *Gregorius, Naz. Epist.* 22. *ad Cæsarienses*, says of the church in Cæsarea in Cappadocia (at the time in the highest rank of hierarchal dignity): ἡ μητὴρ σχεδὸν ἁπασῶν τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν ἥν τε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, καὶ νῦν ἐστι καὶ νομίζεται, καὶ πρὸς ἣν τὸ κοινὸν βλέπει, ὡς κέντρῳ κύκλος περιγραφόμενος. The Egyptian bishops at the Council of Chalcedon, left without a head by the disgrace of Dioscurus, and called upon to subscribe Leo's Epist. ad Flavianum (*Conc. Chalced.* Act. IV. *Mansi* VII. p. 53, 55), declared: Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου — Λέοντος, ἴσασι πάντες οἱ ἁγιώτατοι ἡμῶν πατέρες, ὅτι ἐν ἅπασιν ἀναμένομεν τὴν γνώμην τοῦ παρ' ἡμῖν ὁσιωτάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου. — τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς Νικαίων ἅγιοι πατέρες συναγηγερμένοι ἐκανόνισαν τιή, ὥστε ἀκολουθεῖν πᾶσαν τὴν Αἰγυπτιακὴν διοίκησιν τῷ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ τῆς μεγαλοπόλεως Ἀλεξανδρείας, καὶ μηδὲν δίχα αὐτοῦ πράττεσθαι παρά τινος τῶν ὑπ' αὐτῷ ἐπισκόπων. — περὶ πίστεώς ἐστιν ὁ ἁγών. — παρὰ γνώμην ἀρχιεπισκόπου οὐ δυνάμεθα ὑπογράψαι. And the council allowed them to wait, *Can.* 30 (*Mansi* VII. p. 372) ἄχρις ἂν χειροτονηθῇ ὁ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἀρχιεπίσκοπος.

[17] *Liberati breviar.* c. 4. Quod audiens (namely the heresy of Nestor) Cyrillus Alexandrinus Episcopus, *cui tunc dabatur primatus de talibus agendi*, venerunt ad eum aliqui de populo Constantinopolitano, etc. — So Eutyches at the *Conc. Constantinop.* (*Mansi* VI. p. 817) ἀναγινωσκομένης τῆς καθαιρέσεως, ἐπεκαλέσατο τὴν ἁγίαν σύνοδον τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου ἐπισκόπου Ῥώμης, καὶ Ἀλεξανδρείας, καὶ Ἱεροσολύμων, καὶ Θεσσαλονίκης. Hence he complains of Flavianus at the second Synod of Ephesus, that he had excommunicated him on his sole authority, καίτοι μᾶλλον ὀφείλων πρὸ πάντων τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν ἐπιστεῖλαι, οὓς καὶ ἐπεκαλεσάμην, — namely, the bishops of Rome and Alexandria (*Mansi* VI. p. 641). Hence the flattering title invented for them in the 5th century of universalis Episcopus, which first occurs at the *Conc. Ephes.* II. (*Mansi* VI. p. 855) where it is given to Dioscurus by Olympius Episc. Evazensis.

ple.[18] This right had been sanctioned by custom before it was expressly allowed by law; [19] and was the more readily conceded by the synod that the bishop of Rome, with whom the bishop of Constantinople was considered equal, had long enjoyed the same preference in the West.

§ 92.

HISTORY OF THE ROMAN PATRIACHS,[1] AND OF THE HIERARCHY IN THE WEST.

Vid. *Blondel*, as cited § 88. — *Archibald Bower's* History of the Roman Popes. 5 vols. 4to. Lond. 1750 – 1761. — J. G. Nehr's Geschichte des Papstthums. Leip. 1801. 2 Th. 8vo. — Planck, as above cited, S. 624 ff.

At the head of the richest[2] and only Apostolic church of the Western empire, the metropolitan of several (namely, of the ten Sub-

---

[18] *Can. Chalced.* 9: — εἰ δὲ καὶ κληρικός ἔχοι πράγμα πρὸς τὸν ἴδιον ἐπίσκοπον, ἢ πρὸς ἕτερον, παρὰ τῇ συνόδῳ τῆς ἐπαρχίας δικαζέσθω. εἰ δὲ πρὸς τὸν τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπαρχίας μητροπολίτην ἐπίσκοπος ἢ κληρικὸς ἀμφισβητοίη, καταλαμβανέτω ἢ τὸν ἔξαρχον τῆς διοικήσεως, ἢ τὸν τῆς βασιλευούσης Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θρόνον, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ δικαζέσθω. Repeated *can.* 17.

[19] See note 7 above.

[1] Order of their succession: Sylvester I. from A. D. 314 † 335, Marcus † 336, Julius I. † 352, Liberius banished 355, the Arian Felix till 358, Liberius returns 358, † 366 (contested choice between Damasus and Ursinus or Ursicinus, see note 2), Damasus † 384, Siricius † 398, Anastasius I. † 402, Innocentius I. † 417, Zosimus † 418, Bonifacius I. † 422, Cælestinus I. † 432, Sixtus III. † 440, Leo I. the Great † 461.

[2] *Ammianus Marcellinus* XXVII. c. 3: Damasus et Ursinus supra humanum modum ad rapiendam Episcopatus sedem ardentes, scissis studiis asperrime conflictabantur, adusque mortis vulnerumque discrimina adjumentis utriusque progressis: quæ nec corrigere sufficiens Iuventius (Præf. urbi) nec mollire, coactus vi magna secessit in suburbanum. Et in concertatione superaverat Damasus, parte quæ ei favebat instante. Constatque in basilica Sicinini, ubi ritus Christiani est conventiculum, uno die CXXXVII reperta cadavera peremtorum: efferatamque diu plebem ægre postea delinitam. Neque ego abnuo, ostentationem rerum considerans urbanarum, hujus rei cupidos ob impetrandum, quod appetunt, omni contentione laterum jurgari debere: quum id adepti, futuri sint ita securi, ut ditentur oblationibus matronarum, procedantque vehiculis insidentes, circumspecte vestiti, epulas curantes profusas, adeo ut eorum convivia regales superent mensas. Qui esse poterant beati revera, si magnitudine urbis despecta quam viciis *(conviciis?)* opponunt, ad imitationem Antistitum quorundam provincialium viverent: quos tenuitas edendi potandique parcissime, vilitas etiam indumentorum, et supercilia humum spectantia, perpetuo numini verisque ejus cultoribus ut puros commendant et verecundos. *Hieronymi Ep.* 38 (*al* 61) *ad Pammachium:* Miserabilis Prætextatus, qui designatus consul est mortuus, homo sacrilegus, et idolorum cultor solebat ludens beato papæ Damaso dicere: "Facite me Romanæ urbis episcopum, et ero protinus Christianus." Hence the arrogance of the Roman deacons, as the stewards of such riches, complained of by *Hieronymus Epist.* 101, *ad Evangelum.* See *Pseudo-Augustini* (perhaps *Hilarii Diaconi* about A. D. 380) *Quæstt. vet. et Nov. Test.* (in *August. Opp.* T. III. P. II. *Append.*) *Quæst.* 101: Quia Romanæ Ecclesiæ ministri sunt, idcirco honorabiliores putantur, quam apud ceteras Ecclesias, *propter magnificentiam urbis Romæ*, quæ caput esse videtur omnium civitatum. Si itaque sic est, hoc debent et sacerdotibus suis vindicare: quia, si ii, qui inferiores sunt, crescunt propter magnificentiam civitatis, quanto magis, qui potiores, sublimandi sunt.

urbicarian) provinces,[3] and places in the chief city of the world, the bishop of Rome stood preëminent amongst his brethren from the very beginning of this period. The Eastern church, according to their own principle, could not but concede the highest place to the bishop of the first city in the world,[4] whilst the Western church, estimating the dignity of the bishops by their Apostolic origin,[5] must, of course, place the bishop of Rome above all others, as the successor of the two chief Apostles, and bishop of the only Apostolic church of that region.

The same sense of insecurity and need of mutual support, which had associated together the bishops of the Eastern church during the Arian controversy, now led to the decree of the council of Sardica (A. D. 344),[6] by which all condemned bishops were allowed to appeal to the bishop of Rome.

---

[3] Suburbicaria loca in the *versio Prisca* of the 6th canon of the Council of Nice; see s. 91, note 1. *Rufinus hist. eccl.* X. c. 6, gives that canon as follows: Et ut apud Alexandriam et in urbe Roma vetusta consuetudo servetur, ut vel ille Ægypti, vel hic *suburbicariarum ecclesiarum* sollicitudinem gerat. — *Eccles. suburbic.* means, according to Baronius and Bellarminus Eccl. totius orbis, according to Perronius, Balesius, J. Morinus, Natalis Alexander Eccl. Occidentis. According to J. Gothofredus (Conjectura de suburbicariis Regionibus et ecclesiis Francof. 1617) Claud. Salmasius, J. Launojus, the two Basnages, &c. only the four provinces which were under the Præf. Urbi (intra centesimum ab urbe lapidem). On the other hand, Jac. Sirmond (Censura conjecturæ anonymi script. de suburb. regg. et eccll. 1618) contends with reason, that the provinces subject to the Vicarius urbis or the Diœcesis Romæ are meant, (1. Campania, 2. Tuscia et Umbria, 3. Picenum suburbicarium, 4. Sicilia, 5. Apulia et Calabria, 6. Bruttii et Lucania, 7. Samnium, 8. Sardinia, 9. Corsica, 10. Valeria). That these constituted the Roman diocese is evident also from *Conc. Sardic. Synodica ad Julium* P. (*Mansi* III. p. 41): Tua autem excellens prudentia disponere debet, ut per tua scripta, qui in Sicilia, qui in Sardinia, et in Italia sunt fratres nostri, quæ acta sunt et quæ definita, cognoscant (cf. *Syn. Arelat. Epist.* see above, § 66, note 8). Comp. *du Pin de aut. eccl. discipl.* p. 87 seq. Zieglers Gesch. d. kirchl. Verfassungsformen S. 113 Anm. The numerous ancient works on this subject in *Sagittarianæ introd. in hist. eccl.* T. II. p. 1223 seq. *Fabricii salut. lux Evangelii*, p. 358 seq.

[4] See *Canon Constantinop.* III. and *Chalced.* XXVIII. see § 91.

[5] The principle on which Augustine judged is given by *Pelagius* I. *ad Episcopos Tusciæ*, A. D. 556 (*Mansi* IX. p. 716, also in *Agobardus de comparatione utriusque regiminis*, c. 2): Beatissimus Augustinus dominicæ sententiæ memor, qua fundamentum Ecclesiæ in apostolicis sedibus collocavit, in schismate esse dicit, quicumque se a præsulis [*Agob.* præsulum] earumdem sedium auctoritate vel communione suspenderit; nec aliam manifestat esse ecclesiam, nisi quæ in pontificibus [*Agob.* pontificalibus] apostolicarum sedium est solidata radicibus. Hence against the Donatists *Augustinus Epist.* 43 (al. 162) § 7: Non de presbyteris aut diaconibus aut inferioris ordinis clericis, sed de collegis agebatur, qui possent aliorum collegarum judicio, præsertim apostolicarum ecclesiarum, causam suam integram reservare. *Idem contra litteras Petiliani* II. 51: Verumtamen si omnes per totum orbem tales essent, quales vanissime criminaris, cathedra tibi quid fecit Ecclesiæ Romanæ, in qua Petrus sedit, et in qua hodie Anastasius sedet: vel Ecclesiæ Hierosolymitanæ, in qua Jacobus sedit, et in qua hodie Joannes sedet, quibus nos in catholica unitate connectimur, et a quibus vos nefario furore separastis?

[6] On the double original of the acts of this council, one Greek and one Latin, see *Ballerini* de ant. collect. cann. P. I. cap. 5. Spittler in Meusels Geschichtsforscher Th. 4 (Halle 1777) S. 33 ff. — *Can* III. (from Dionysius Exig. cod. can. in Mansi T. III. p. 23), Osius Episcopus dixit: — Quod si aliquis Epis-

Very few having availed themselves of this permission,[7] the emperor Gratian, at the instance of Damasus and a Roman synod (A. D. 378), issued a decree to the same purpose.[8]

Another source of influence to the Roman bishops was the custom of referring to them particularly as the head of the only Apostolic church of the West,[9] all questions concerning the Apostolic customs

---

coporum judicatus fuerit in aliqua causa, et putat se bonam causam habere, ut iterum concilium renovetur; si vobis placet, Sancti Petri, Apostoli memoriam honoremus, ut scribatur ab his, qui causam examinarunt, Julio Romano episcopo: et si judicaverit renovandum esse judicium, renovetur, et det judices. Si autem probaverit, talem causam esse, ut non refricentur ea quæ acta sunt; quæ decreverit confirmata erunt. Si hoc omnibus placet? Synodus respondit: Placet. *Can.* IV.: Gaudentius episcopus dixit: Addendum, si placet, huic sententiæ, quam plenam sanctitate protulistis; ut, cum aliquis episcopus depositus fuerit eorum episcoporum judicio, qui in vicinis locis commorantur, et proclamaverit, agendum sibi negotium in urbe Roma: alter episcopus in ejus cathedra, post appellationem ejus qui videtur esse depositus, omnino non ordinetur, nisi causa fuerit in judicio episcopi Romani determinata. *Can.* VII. *(in Græco* V.): Osius episcopus dixit: Placuit autem, ut, si episcopus accusatus fuerit, et judicaverint congregati episcopi regionis ipsius, et de gradu suo eum dejecerint; si appellaverit qui dejectus est, et confugerit ad episcopum Romanæ ecclesiæ, et voluerit se audiri: si justum putaverit, ut renovetur examen, scribere his episcopis dignetur, qui in finitima et propinqua provincia sunt, ut ipsi diligenter omnia requirant, et juxta fidem veritatis definiant. Quod si is qui rogat causam suam iterum audiri, deprecatione sua moverit episcopum Romanum, ut de latere suo presbyterum mittat; erit in potestate episcopi, quid velit, et quid æstimet. Et si decreverit, mittendos esse, qui præsentes cum episcopis judicent, habentes ejus auctoritatem, a quo destinati sunt, erit in suo arbitrio. Si vero crediderit episcopos sufficere, ut negotio terminum imponant, faciet, quod sapientissimo consilio suo judicaverit. According to *Richerii* histor. concil. general. T. I. p. 46, this privilege was granted only to Julius individually. — Comp. *de Marca* de Conc. Sac. et Imp. lib. VII. c. 3, *du Pin.* de ant. eccl. disc. p. 103 seq. — Doubts of the authenticity of the canons of this council, *Mich. Geddes* diss. de Sardicensibus canon. in his Miscell. Tract. T. II. p. 415. Sarpi in Le Brets Magazin für Staaten, u. Kirchengesch. Th. I. (Ulm. 1771) S. 429 ff. comp. Le Brets Anm. Ibid. S. 435 ff.

[7] *de Marca* l. c. lib. VII. c. 11 et 12.

[8] *Epist. Romani Concilii ad Gratian. et Valentin. Impp.* and the *Rescriptum Gr. et Val. ad Aquilinum Vicar. Urbis* (A. D. 378) in Sirmonds *App. Cod. Theod. Mansi* III. p. 624 seq., and in Coustant. In the *Rescriptum* we read, c. 6: Volumus autem, ut quicunque judicio Damasi, quod ille cum consilio quinque vel septem habuerit episcoporum, vel eorum, qui catholici sunt, judicio vel concilio condemnatus fuerit, si injuste voluerit ecclesiam retentare: ut qui evocatus ad sacerdotale judicium per contumaciam non ivisset, aut ab illustribus viris præfectis prætorio Galliæ atque Italiæ, sive a proconsulibus vel vicariis, auctoritate adhibita, ad episcopale judicium remittatur, vel ad urbem Romam sub prosecutione perveniat: aut si in longinquioribus partibus alicujus ferocitas talis emerserit, omnis ejus causæ dictio ad metropolitæ in eadem provincia episcopi deducatur examen; vel si ipse metropolitanus est, Romam necessario, vel ad eos, quos Romanus episcopus judices dederit, sine dilatione contendat, ita tamen, ut quicunque dejecti sunt, ab ejus tantum urbis finibus segregentur, in quibus fuerint sacerdotes. Minus enim graviter meritos coërceemus, et sacrilegam pertinaciam lenius quam meretur ulciscimur. Quod si vel metropolitani episcopi vel cujuscunque sacerdotis iniquitas est suspecta, aut gratia: ad Romanum episcopum vel ad concilium quindecim episcoporum finitimorum accersitum liceat provocare: modo ne post examen habitum quod definitum fuerit integretur.

[9] Though not exclusively, cf. *Conc. Carthagin.* III. (*ann.* 397) c. 48 *(Mansi* III. p. 891): De Donatistis placuit, ut consulamus fratres et consacerdotes nostros *Siricium* (the bishop of Rome) et *Simplicianum* (the bishop of Milan) de

and doctrines, which, in the East, were addressed indiscriminately to the bishops of any church founded by an Apostle.[10] This gave them occasion to issue a vast number of didactic letters (*Epistolæ decretales*),[11] which soon assumed a tone of Apostolic authority, and were held in high estimation in the West, as flowing from Apostolic tradition.

The Eastern bishops, it is true, would not suffer the least interference of the Western in their affairs. When Julius I., at the head of the Western bishops, attempted to interfere in behalf of the persecuted Athanasius, he met with a marked and indignant repulse,[12] and with-

---

solis infantibus, qui baptizantur penes eosdem, num — parentum illos error impediat, ne provehantur sacri altaris ministri. We have here at the same time an example of the great regard paid to these decisions: the two bishops answered in the affirmative; afterwards the deficiency of priests in Africa making a different decision desirable, the Concil. African. ann. 401 (*Mansi* IV. p. 482) resolved to send an embassy ad transmarinas Italiæ partes, ut tam sanctis fratribus et consacerdotibus nostris, venerabili sancto fratri Anastasio, sedis apostolicæ Episcopo, quam etiam sancto fratri Venerio sacerdoti Mediolanensis Ecclesiæ necessitatem ipsam ac dolorem atque inopiam nostram valeat intimare (ex his enim sedibus hoc fuerat prohibitum): quo noverint communi periculo providendum, maxime quia tanta indigentia clericorum est, etc.

[10] Vid. the Epistolæ Canonicæ, cited § 68 above, and similar ones were issued in this Period by the Alexandrian bishops, Athanasius, Timotheus, and Theophilus, and Basil the Great, bishop of Cæsarea.

[11] (Spittlers) Gesch. des kanon. Rechts bis auf die Zeiten des falschen Isidorus. Halle, 1778. S. 157 ff. The earliest Decretals those of *Siricius* ad Himerium Episc. Tarraconensem, A. D. 385.

[12] The Synod of Antioch (A. D. 341) had complained to Julius of his conduct in not regarding the sentence of the Eastern Church. Of this letter fragments are found in Sozomen. III. 8. Amongst other things they said, φέρειν μὲν γὰρ πᾶσι φιλοτιμίαν τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίαν, ὡς ἀποστόλων φροντιστήριον, καὶ εὐσεβείας μητρόπολιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς γεγεννημένην· — οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο δὲ τὰ δευτερεῖα φέρειν ἠξίουν, ὅτι μὴ μεγέθει η πλήθει ἐκκλησίας πλειονεκτοῦσιν, ὡς ἀρετῇ καὶ προαιρέσει νικῶντες κ. τ. λ. In answer to this see *Julii* I. *Ep. ad Syn. Antiochenam* (*Athanasius Apol. contra Arian.* c. 21 seq. *Mansi* II. p. 1211, *Coustant-Schœneman*, p. 210 seq.) After having shown the irregularity of the proceedings against Athanasius and Marcellus, he says at the close, Εἰ γὰρ καὶ ὅλως, ὡς φατὶ, γέγονέ τι εἰς αὐτοὺς ἁμάρτημα, ἔδει κατὰ τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κανόνα, καὶ μὴ οὕτως γεγενῆσθαι τὴν κρίσιν· ἔδει γραφῆναι πᾶσιν ἡμῖν, ἵνα οὕτως παρὰ πάντων ὁρισθῇ τὸ δίκαιον. ἐπίσκοποι γὰρ ἦσαν οἱ πάσχοντες, καὶ οὐχ αἱ τυχοῦσαι ἐκκλησίαι αἱ πάσχουσαι, ἀλλ' ὧν αὐτοὶ οἱ Ἀπόστολοι δι' ἑαυτῶν καθηγήσαντο. Διατί δὲ περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐκκλησίας μάλιστα οὐκ ἐγράφετο ἡμῖν; ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι τοῦτο ἔθος ἦν, πρότερον γράφεσθαι ἡμῖν, καὶ οὕτως ἔνθεν ἐρίζεσθαι τὰ δίκαια; Εἰ μὲν οὖν τι τοιοῦτον ἦν ὑποπτευθὲν εἰς τὸν ἐπίσκοπον τὸν ἐκεῖ, ἔδει πρὸς τὴν ἐνταῦθα ἐκκλησίαν γραφῆναι. Julius, therefore, did not pretend to judge Athanasius and Marcellus alone, but in conjunction with all the bishops (comp. note 17). This grew out of the notion of the superior dignity of the bishops of Apostolic churches, (see note 5), and such these were. Vid. *de Marca* de concord. Sac. et Imp. lib. VII. c. 4, § 2, 6 seq. The Orientals, on the other hand, replied, *Epist. Synodalis Syn. Sardicensis* (Philippopoli habita) *ad Donatum* (in *Hilarii fragm.* lib. II. in *Mansi* III. p. 136): Hanc novitatem moliebantur inducere, quam horret vetus consuetudo ecclesiæ, ut in concilio orientales Episcopi quidquid forte statuissent, ab Episcopis occidentalibus refricaretur: similiter quidquid occidentalium partium Episcopi, ab orientalibus solveretur. Sed hoc ex illo suo pravissimo sensu tractabant. Verum omnium conciliorum juste legitimeque actorum decreta firmanda, majorum nostrorum gesta consignant. Nam in urbe Roma sub Novato et Sabellio et Valentino hæreticis factum concilium, ab Orientalibus confirmatum est: et iterum in oriente sub Paulo a Samosatis quod statu-

out exception, the principle of perfect independence was strictly maintained.[13] Still, the period of the dogmatic controversies added very much to the influence of the Roman bishop, even with the Eastern churches. The speculative questions which convulsed the Eastern churches, excited little interest in the Western. Hence the views of the bishop of Rome, who was almost the only organ of communication with the Eastern church,[14] and through whom, therefore, chiefly, they became acquainted with its controversies, were for the most part adopted without hesitation. In all these controversies, the West stood aloof, united and unwavering, with the bishop of Rome at its head, and when the decisive moment arrived, the scale was always turned by its influence. The first instance of this, was in the final victory of the doctrines of the council of Nice, in the Arian controversy. When these doctrines began to spread in the East, under the emperor Valens, these new Nicenians, it is true, could not unite wholly with those in the West, and even complained of their arrogance.[15] Yet, at the same time, in all their conflicts with other parties, it was here alone that they could look for support. And though, afterwards (A. D. 381), the council of Constantinople arranged the affairs of the Eastern church without any reference whatever to the Western, and even openly took the part of the Meletians, whom that church had condemned;[16] and not long after, the interference of the Italian bishops in favor of the rejected bishop Maximus, was entirely disregarded;[17] yet it was plain enough that the great question

---

tum est, ab omnibus est signatum. — Nos vero nulli injuriam facimus, sed legis præcepta servamus. Nam injuriati et male tractati sumus ab iis qui volebant ecclesiæ catholicæ regulam sua pravitate turbare: sed ante oculos habentes timorem Dei, judicium Christi, verum et justum considerantes, nullius personam accepimus, neque alicui pepercimus, quo minus ecclesiasticam disciplinam servaremus. Unde Julium urbis Romæ, Osium et Protogenem et Gaudentium et Maximinum a Treveris damnavit omne concilium secundum antiquissimam legem: Julium vero urbis Romæ, ut principem et ducem malorum, qui primus januam communionis sceleratis atque damnatis aperuit, ceterisque aditum fecit ad solvenda jura divina, defendebatque Athanasium præsumenter atque audaciter, hominem, cujus nec testes noverat, nec accusatores.

[13] *Constantii Imp. Ep. ad Syn. Ariminensem*, A. D. 359 (and *Mansi* III. p. 297): Non enim de orientalibus Episcopis in concilio vestro patitur ratio aliquid definiri. Proinde super his tantum, quæ ad vos pertinere cognoscit gravitas vestra, tractare debebitis. — Quæ cum ita sint, adversus orientales nihil statuere vos oportet, aut si aliquid volueritis contra eosdem prædictis absentibus definire, id quod fuerit usurpatum irrito evanescet effectu. At the *Concil. Aquilejense ann.* 381, Palladius, being accused of Arianism, answered (*Mansi* III. p. 602): Absentibus sacerdotibus nostris nos respondere non possumus. *Ambrosius Episcopus dixit:* Qui sunt consortes vestri? *Palladius dixit:* Orientales Episcopi. — *cf. Leo. Allatius de Eccles. Occid. et Orient. perp. consens.* lib. I. c. 10. Concerning the appeal from the East to Rome, see *de Marca de concord. Sac. et Imp.* lib. VII. c. 6–10. *Du Pin de ant. eccl. discipl.* p. 156 seq.

[14] *Augustin. contra Cresconium*, III. 34: ad Carthaginis Episcopum Romano prætermisso nunquam orientalis catholica scribit.

[15] See § 81, note 17.

[16] See § 81, note 22.

[17] *Epist.* II. *Concilii Italiæ ad Theodos. Imp.* (prim. ed. *J. Sirmond* in *App. Cod. Theod. Mansi* III. p. 631): revera advertebamus Gregorium nequaquam

of the day had been decided by the firmness and stability of the Western church. But whatever influence abroad was thus gained by the Western church, was gained for the bishop of Rome, as the only organ of communication between the two churches.[18] From this time forth, there was no controversy in the East in which each party did not seek to win the bishop of Rome, and through him the Western church,[19] to its cause, vying with each other in flattery and servility. At the councils his legates were always treated with the greatest deference, and at the council of Chalcedon, they, for the first time, presided.[20]

We have seen that in the West, the dignity of the different bishops was estimated by their origin,[21] and that certain privileges had been

---

secundum traditionem patrum Constantinopolitanæ ecclesiæ sibi sacerdotium vindicare. — At eo ipso tempore, qui generale concilium declinaverunt, Constantinopoli quæ gessisse dicuntur? Nam cum cognovissent ad hoc partium venisse Maximum, ut causam in synodo ageret suam, quod etiamsi indictum concilium non fuisset, jure et more majorum, sicut et sanctæ memoriæ Athanasius, et dudum Petrus Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ Episcopi, et orientalium plerique fecerunt, ut ad ecclesiæ Romanæ, Italiæ, et totius Occidentis confugisse judicium viderentur; — præstolari utique etiam nostram super eo sententiam debuerunt. Non prærogativam vindicamus examinis, sed consortium tamen debuit esse communis arbitrii. — Nectarium autem cum nuper nostra mediocritas Constantinopoli cognoverit ordinatum, cohærere communionem nostram cum orientalibus partibus non videmus. — Nec videmus eam posse aliter convenire, nisi aut is reddatur Constantinopoli qui prior est ordinatus, aut certe super duorum ordinatione sit in urbe Roma nostrum orientaliumque concilium. The Orientals answered to this in the *Synodica Conc. Constantinop. ann.* 382 *ad Occidentales (Theodoret.* V. c. 9): περὶ δὲ τῶν οἰκονομιῶν τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, παλαιός τε, ὡς ἔστι, θεσμὸς κεκράτηκε, καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἐν Νικαίᾳ πατέρων ὅρος, καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν τοὺς τῆς ἐπαρχίας — ποιεῖσθαι τὰς χειροτονίας. Οἷς ἀκολούθως — τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει — ἐκκλησίας — Νεκτάριον ἐπίσκοπον κεχειροτονήκαμεν. — οἷς ὡς ἐνθέσμως καὶ κανονικῶς παρ' ἡμῖν κεκρατηκόσι, καὶ τὴν ὑμετέραν συγχαίρειν παρακαλοῦμεν εὐλάβειαν.

[18] The κορυφαῖος τῶν δυτικῶν, see § 81, note 17. Comp. *Cod. Theod.* XVI. 1, 2, § 81, note 21.

[19] *Socrates* II. 8, says that there was no Roman legate at the council of Antioch, καίτοι κανόνος ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ κελεύοντος, μὴ δεῖν παρὰ τὴν γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Ῥώμης τὰς ἐκκλησίας κανονίζειν. Socrates was no doubt led to this remark by the words of Julius I.: τοῦτο ἔθος ἦν, πρότερον γράφεσθαι ἡμῖν, καὶ οὕτως ἔνθεν ὁρίζεσθαι τὰ δίκαια (see note 12), which *Sozomenus* III. 10, also interprets too widely, when he gives as their sense: εἶναι γὰρ νόμον ἱερατικὸν, ὡς ἄκυρα ἀποφαίνειν τὰ παρὰ γνώμην πραττόμενα τοῦ Ῥωμαίων ἐπισκόπου (*de Marca* lib. V. c. 12. § 1). Still there must have been something in the customs of the church which justifies this mode of interpretation. That there was no such law in existence as both of these writers refer to, is plain from *Can. Constant.* 3 (see § 91, note 8), and *Chalced.* 28 (see § 91, note 12). The mystery is explained by the historical connexion as above given. — This very example, however, illustrates in a remarkable manner the influence of such kinds of mistakes on the practice of the church. This passage of Socrates is translated in the *Historia tripartita:* non debere absque sententia Romani Pontificis *Concilia celebrari.* — This sentence the Pseudo-Isidorian decretals eagerly availed themselves of, and at length introduced into the practice of the church.

[20] On the mode in which the general councils were conducted, see *de Marca,* lib. V. c. 3 — c. 6, and *Bæhmeri observ. ad hæc cap.* p. 113 seq. — J. A. Cramer in the Appendix to J. A. Bossuets Gesch. d. Welt. Th. 1. S. 612 ff. Plancks Geschichte der kirchl. Gesellschaftsverf. Bd. 1. S. 683 ff.

[21] See note 5.

bestowed upon the Roman bishops by the council of Sardica, in deference to their descent from the Apostle Peter. It was on this Apostolic descent, alone, that the Roman bishops founded all their claims to distinction.[22] At the same time, they strenuously opposed the opinion that they and the other patriarchs owed their preëminence to the importance of the cities in which they resided;[23] and hence their opposition to the honors paid the bishop of Constantinople, for which no other reason was pretended than his residence in the chief city of the East. But though they traced back the original dignity of the Roman see to its Apostolical origin, and its parental relation to the other churches of the West,[24] they acknowledged that their peculiar privileges did not originally belong to them as the successors of Peter, but had been conferred on them in early times.[25] In that age, indeed, they could hardly claim any particular preëminence over the successors of the other Apostles, since, as yet, no especial trust was

---

[22] On the original signification of the expression Vicarius Petri see *Cypriani Ep.* 67 *ad Steph. Ep. Rom.* Servandus est enim antecessorum nostrorum beatorum martyrum Cornelii et Lucii honor gloriosus: quorum memoriam cum nos honoremus, multo magis tu, frater carissime, honorificare — debes, qui vicarius et successor eorum factus es.

[23] *Epist. Innocentii ad Alexandrum Episc. Antioch.* about A. D. 415 (ap. Coustant Ep. Innoc. 24): Revolventes itaque auctoritatem Nicænæ synodi, quæ una omnium per orbem terrarum mentem explicat sacerdotum, quæ censuit de Antiochena ecclesia cunctis fidelibus, ne dixerim sacerdotibus, esse necessarium custodire, qua super diœcesin suam prædictam ecclesiam, non super aliquam provinciam recognoscimus constitutam. Unde advertimus, non tam pro civitatis magnificentia hoc eidem attributum, quam quod prima primi Apostoli sedes esse monstretur, ubi et nomen accepit religio Christiana, et quæ conventum Apostolorum apud se fieri celeberrimum meruit, *quæque urbis Romæ sedi non cederet, nisi quod illa in transitu meruit, ista susceptum apud se consummatumque gauderet.* The same principle applied to the Metropolitans. *Ibid.* Quod sciscitaris, utrum divisis imperiali judicio provinciis ut duæ, metropoles fiant, sic duo metropolitani episcopi debeant nominari; non esse e re visum est, ad mobilitatem necessitatum mundanarum Dei ecclesiam commutari.

[24] *Innocentii* I. *Ep.* 25 *ad Decentium*, A. D. 416, § 2: Quis enim nesciat aut non advertat, id quod a principe Apostolorum Petro Romanæ ecclesiæ traditum est, ac nunc usque custoditur, ab omnibus debere servari; nec superinduci aut introduci aliquid, quod auctoritatem non habeat, aut aliunde accipere videatur exemplum? præsertim cum sit manifestum, in omnem Italiam, Gallias, Hispanias, Africam atque Siciliam, et insulas interjacentes, nullum instituisse ecclesias, nisi eos quos venerabilis Apostolus Petrus aut ejus successores constituerint sacerdotes. Aut legant, si in his provinciis alius Apostolorum invenitur, aut legitur docuisse. Qui si non legunt, quia nusquam inveniunt, oportet eos hoc sequi, quod ecclesia Romana custodit, a qua eos principium accepisse non dubium est; ne dum peregrinis assertionibus student, caput institutionum videantur omittere.

[25] *Innocent.* I. *Ep.* 2 *ad Victricium* § 6: Si majores causæ in medium fuerint devolutæ, ad sedem apostolicam, sicut synodus statuit, et beata consuetudo exigit, post judicium episcopale referantur. *Ejusd. Ep.* 29 *ad Carthag. Concil.* (amongst the letters of Augustine Ep. 181) § 1: patres non humana sed divina decrevere sententia, ut quidquid quamvis de disjunctis remotisque provinciis ageretur, non prius ducerent finiendum, nisi ad hujus sedis notitiam perveniret. Comp. note 10 and note 19. — *Zosimi Ep.* 2 *ad Episc. Afr.* § 1: His accedit apostolicæ sedis auctoritas, cui in honorem beatissimi Petri patrum decreta peculiarem quandam sanxere reverentiam. *Valentiniani* III. *Ep. ad Theodosium, Aug.* A. D. 450 (Leonis M. Epistt. ed. Ballerini Ep. 55): ὁ μακαριώτατος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Ῥωμαίων πόλεως, ᾧ τὴν ἱερωσύνην κατὰ πάντων ἡ ἀρχαιότης περίεχει.

supposed to have been committed to Peter, but merely a primatus honoris, Christ having given him first those rights which were afterwards extended to all the Apostles, and through them to their successors.[26] And, as according to this view, men did not scruple to attribute precisely the same dignity and authority to other Apostles as to Peter,[27]

---

[26] In the passage, Matth. xvi. 18, πέτρα was usually understood of the declaration of Peter (Hilarius, Gregor. Russ. Ambrosius, Chrysostomus, etc.) or of Christ (Jerome, Augustinus), more seldom of the person of Peter *(Hieron. Ep.* 14 *al.* 57, *ad Damasum)* cf. *Casauboni Exercit. ad Baron.* XV. *num.* 13 seq. *Suicer thes. eccl. s.* v. πέτρα. *Du Pin de ant. eccl. discipl. diss.* IV. c. 1, § I. As to Matth. xvi. 19. however, the old view (see § 66, note 7) was generally retained. *Optatus Milev.* lib. VII.: Præferri Petrus cæteris Apostolis meruit, et claves regni cælorum communicandas cæteris solus accepit. *Augustinus de diversis serm.* 108: Has enim claves non homo unus, sed unitas accepit ecclesiæ. Hinc ergo Petri excellentia prædicatur, quia ipsius universitatis et unitatis ecclesiæ figuram gessit, quando ei dictum est: *tibi trado*, quod omnibus traditum est. Nam ut noveritis, ecclesiam accepisse claves regni cœlorum, audite in alio loco, quid dominus dicat omnibus Apostolis suis: *accipete Sp. s.* et continuo: *si cui dimiseritis peccata, dimittentur ei, si cui tenueritis, tenebuntur.* — *Idem in Evang. Joannis Tract.* 124, § 5: Ecclesiæ Petrus Apostolus propter Apostolatus sui primatum gerebat figurata generalitate personam. — Quando ei dictum est: *Tibi dabo claves regni cælorum* cæt., universam significabat Ecclesiam, quæ in hoc sæculo diversis tentationibus — quatitur, et non cadit, quoniam fundata est super petram, unde Petrus nomen accepit. Non enim a Petro petra, sed Petrus, a petra, sicut non Christus a Christiano, sed Christianus a Christo vocatur. Ideo quippe ait Dominus: *super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam*, quia dixerat Petrus: *Tu es Christus Filius Dei vivi.* Super hanc ergo, inquit, petram quam confessus es, ædificabo Ecclesiam meam. Petra enim erat Christus, super quod fundamentum etiam ipse ædificatus est Petrus. — Ecclesia ergo, quæ fundatur in Christo, claves ab eo regni cælorum accepit in Petro, i. e. potestatem ligandi solvendique peccata. *Hieronymus in Amos* vi. 12: petra Christus est, qui donavit Apostolis suis, ut ipsi quoque petræ vocentur: Tu es Petrus, etc. — *Hieronymus adv. Jovinian.* lib. I.: At dicis: super Petrum fundatur Ecclesia: licet idipsum in alio loco super omnes Apostolos fiat, et cuncti claves regni cælorum accipiant, et ex æquo super eos fortitudo Ecclesiæ solidetur, tamen propterea unus eligitur ut capite constituto schismatis tollatur occasio. cf. *du Pin* l. c. *diss.* VI. § 1. *Launoji* lib. II. *Ep.* 5. Hence all bishops were considered the successors of Peter: *Siricii Ep.* 5 *ad Episc. Africæ* § 1, and *Innocentius* I. *Ep.* 2, § 2: per Petrum et Apostolatus et Episcopatus in Christo cepit exordium. *Innocentius* I. *Ep.* 29 ad Concil. Carthag. § 1: a Petro ipse Episcopatus et tota auctoritas nominis hujus emersit. *Augustini sermo* 296, § 11: Ergo commendavit nobis Dominus oves suas, quia Petro commendavit. *Gaudentii sermo die ordinationis habita:* Ambrosius — tanquam Petri Apostoli successor. cf. *Baluzii not. ad Servatum Lupum.* (ed. Paris 1664) p. 422 seq.

[27] Especially Paul: *Ambrosii sermo* II. *in festo Petri et Pauli* (*Sermo* 66, also entitled *Augustini de sanctis sermo*, and *Maximi Taurinensis sermo* 54): Ergo beati Petrus et Paulus eminent inter universos Apostolos, et peculiari quadam prærogativa præcellunt. Verum inter ipsos, quis cui præponatur, incertum est. Puto enim illos æquales esse meritis, qui æquales sunt passione. — Et in quo tandem loco iidem martyrium pertulerunt? In urbe Roma, quæ principatum et caput obtinet nationum: scilicet ut, ubi caput superstitionis erat, illic caput quiesceret sanctitatis; et ubi gentilium principes habitabant, illic ecclesiarum principes morerentur. So too *Idem de Spir. Sancto* c. 12. *Augustinus de sanctis sermo* 25: Etsi Petrum priorem, tamen ambos ditavit honore uno. *Gaudentius serm. de Petro et Paulo:* Quem cui præponere audeam nescio. *Ambrosiaster ad Gal.* ii. 11: Nam quis eorum auderet Petro primo Apostolo, cui claves regni cælorum Dominus dedit, resistere, nisi alius talis, qui fiducia electionis suæ sciens se non imparem, constanter improbaret, quod ille sine consilio fecerat? In *Theodoreti comm. in Epist. Pauli.* The passage Gal. ii. 6–14 has undoubtedly been

the bishop of Rome could hardly pretend to have inherited from him any power over the other bishops.[28]

But after the rights of the Roman bishops had become more fixed in the West, and their influence very considerable even in the East, they began to take a different view of their dignity as the successors of Peter, and to rest all their claims on this ground,[29] a view which we first find fully developed by Leo the Great. In like manner, the church of Jerusalem laid claim to be considered as the mother of the church universal,[30] in right of its descent from the Apostle James,[31]

---

erased out of regard to the Roman church (see *Nesselti corollarium* to the *Præf.* in *Theodoret. Opp.* T. III. of the Halle ed.). Hence the remarkable notion of *Anton Arnauld*, that Peter and Paul were alike the heads of the church (see De l'autorité de St. Pierre et de St. Paul, résidant dans le Pape leur successeur. Paris 1645, 8vo. and De la grandeur de l'église Rom. etablie sur l'autorité de saint Pierre et saint Paul. Paris 1645, the first work by *Arnauld*, the other by *Martin de Barcos*), a doctrine which the inquisition condemned A. D. 1647, as Jansenism. See *Ittigii diss. de origine controversiæ circa æqualem Petri et Pauli primatum* in his. *Heptas dissertt.* appended to the *Dissertt. de hæresiarchis ævi apostolici*, p. 401 seq.— Other apostles, however, were also made equal to Peter. *Hieronymus in Psalm* lxvii. calls Petrum et Andream Apostolorum principes. *Cyrilli et Syn. Alexandr. Epist. ad Nestorium* § 5 (in *Actis Conc. Ephes* in *Mansi* IV. p. 1073): Πέτρος τε καὶ Ἰωάννης ἰσότιμοι ἀλλήλοις. Concerning James see note 30.

[28] *Hieron. Epist.* 101 (al. 85) *ad Evangelum:* Nec altera Romanæ urbis ecclesia, altera totius orbis existimanda est. Et Galliæ, et Britanniæ, et Africa, et Persis, et Oriens, et India, et omnes barbaræ nationes unum Christum adorant: unam observant regulam veritatis. Si auctoritas quæritur, *orbis major est urbe.* Ubicunque fuerit Episcopus, sive Romæ, sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopoli, sive Rhegii, sive Alexandriæ, sive Tanis: ejusdem meriti, ejusdem est et sacerdotii. Potentia divitiarum et paupertatis humilitas vel sublimiorem vel inferiorem Episcopum non fecit. Cæterum omnes Apostolorum successores sunt. Sed dicis, quomodo Romæ ad testimonium diaconi presbyter ordinatur? Quid mihi profers unius urbis consuetudinem? Quid paucitatem, de qua ortum est supercilium, in leges ecclesiæ vindicas? etc.

[29] Thus the Roman legates at the *Conc. Ephesin. ann.* 431, e. g. *Actio* III. (*Mansi* IV. p. 1296): Οὐδενὶ ἀμφίβολόν ἐστι, μᾶλλον δὲ πᾶσι τοῖς αἰῶσιν ἐγνώσθη, ὅτι ὁ ἅγιος καὶ μακαριώτατος Πέτρος, ὁ ἔξαρχος καὶ κεφαλὴ τῶν ἀποστόλων, ὁ κίων τῆς πίστεως, ὁ θεμέλιος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ — τὰς κλεῖς τῆς βασιλείας ἐδέξατο· καὶ αὐτῷ δέδοται ἐξουσία τοῦ δεσμεῖν καὶ λύειν ἁμαρτίας· ὅστις ἕως τοῦ νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ διαδόχοις καὶ ζῇ, καὶ δικάζει,

[30] *Hesychii presb. Hierosolym.* († 343) *Photius cod.* 275: πῶς ἐγκωμιάσω τὸν τῆς νέας Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἀρχιστράτηγον, τὸν τῶν ἱερέων ἡγεμόνα, τῶν ἀποστόλων τὸν ἔξαρχον, τὸν ἐν κεφαλαῖς κορυφήν, τὸν ἐν λύχνοις ὑστερλάμποντα, τὸν ἐν ἄστροις ὑπερφαίνοντα; Πέτρος δημηγορεῖ, ἀλλ' Ἰάκωβος νομοθετεῖ, καὶ ὀλίγα λέξεις τὸ τοῦ ζητήματος συνέστειλαν μίγιθος· α ἐγὼ κρίνω μὴ παρενοχλεῖν τοῖς ἀπὸ "τῶν ἐθνῶν" καὶ ἐξῆς (Act. xv. 19). *Epiphanius hær.* LXXVIII. § 7: καὶ πρῶτος οὗτος εἴληφε τὴν καθέδραν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, ᾧ πεπίστευκε κύριος τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς πρώτῳ, ὃς καὶ ἐκαλεῖτο ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου. *Chrysostomus hom.* 33 in *Acta Apost. cap.* xv. praises James for allowing Peter and Paul to speak first, although himself τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐγκεχειρισμένος.

[31] *Juvenalis Episc. Hieros.* in *Conc. Ephes. Act.* IV. (*Mansi* IV. p. 1312): Ἐχρῆν μὲν Ἰωάννην τὸν εὐλαβέστατον ἐπίσκοπον Ἀντιοχείας — τὸν ἀποστολικὸν θρόνον συνεδρεύοντα ἡμῖν τῆς μεγάλης Ῥώμης τιμῆσαι, καὶ τῷ ἀποστολικῷ τῆς Ἱεροσολύμων ἁγίας τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας ὑπακοῦσαι, παρ' ᾧ μάλιστα ἔθος αὐτὸν τῶν Ἀντιοχέων θρόνον ἐξ ἀποστολικῆς ἀκολουθίας καὶ παραδόσεως ἐθύνεσθαι καὶ παρ' αὐτῷ δικάζεσθαι. (τιμῆσαι is erroneously placed in some editions after ὑπακοῦσαι.)

whom it wished to set above all the other Apostles. But this attempt was rendered wholly ineffectual by its comparative insignificance.

Great as was the dignity of the Roman bishops in the West, the degree of their influence was very different in the different provinces. It was only in the Diocesis Romæ, that they had the full rights of patriarchs. In the Diocesis Italiæ, the bishop of Milan exercised an independent and almost patriarchal authority: and, at a later period, the bishops of Aquileia and Ravenna were raised to the rank of independent hierarchs.[32] On the other hand, however, the Roman bishops, by a skilful use of opportunities, added East Illyria to their patriarchate.[33] During the Arian controversy, Illyria had belonged to the Western empire, and the Illyrian church had adhered to the decrees of the council of Nice,[34] adopting the opinion of the bishop of Rome, as was common in the Western churches. When, therefore, Illyria was divided by Gratian into East and West, and East Illyria annexed to the Eastern church, the bishops of that province were naturally averse to a union with those from whom they differed in opinion, while their chief, the bishop of Thessalonica, shrank from a measure which must make him subject to so near a neighbour as the bishop of Constantinople.

Under these circumstances it was not difficult for the Roman bishops to persuade the bishop of Thessalonica to undertake the exercise of the patriarchal rights in the new province of East Illyria as their Vicar. This arrangement was made by Damasus and Siricius; Innocent I. seems to have considered it as already fixed.[35]

The East Illyrian bishops, indeed, who, at so great a distance from Rome, were entirely at the mercy of the bishop of Thessalonica, were soon dissatisfied; but all attempts to procure an imperial decree for their union with the Patriarchate of Constantinople, were fruitless.[36]

---

[32] Zieglers Gesch. d. kirchl. Verfassungsformen S. 321 ff.

[33] See especially *de Marca de concord. Sac. et Imp.* Lib. V. c. 19—c. 29 (which belongs to Baluzius' continuation), together with Böhmers remarks on this work, *Observ.* 15 seq.

[34] When Theodosius, A. D. 380, was baptized by Ascholius, bishop of Thessalonica, *Sozom.* VII. 4: ἥσθη δὲ (Θεοδόσιος) καὶ Ἰλλυριοῖς ἅπασι μὴ μεταστρέψοι τοῦ Ἀρείου δόξης· συνθανόμενος δὲ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν, μέχρι μὲν Μακεδόνων ἔγνω τὰς Ἐκκλησίας ὁμονοεῖν, — ἐντεῦθεν δὲ τὰ πρὸς ἕω σπασιάζειν κ. τ. λ.

[35] *Innocentii* I. *Ep.* 13 *ad Rufum Ep. Thessal.* Divinitus ergo hæc procurrens gratia ita longis intervallis disterminatis a me ecclesiis discat (*leg.* dictat) consulendum, ut prudentiæ gravitatique tuæ committendam curam causasque, si quæ exoriantur per Achajæ, Thessaliæ, Epiri veteris, Epiri novæ, et Cretæ, Daciæ Mediterraneæ, Daciæ Ripensis, Mœsiæ, Dardaniæ et Prævali ecclesias, Christo Domino annuente censeant (*leg.* censeam). — non primitus hæc ita statuentes, sed præcessores nostros apostolicos imitati, qui beatissimis Acholio et Anysio injungi pro eorum meritis ista voluerunt. — Arripe itaque, dilectissime frater, nostra vice per suprascriptas ecclesias, salvo earum primatu, curam: et inter ipsos primates primus, quidquid eos ad nos necesse fuerit mittere, non sine tuo postulent arbitratu. Ita enim aut per tuam experientiam quidquid illud est finietur: aut tuo consilio ad nos usque perveniendum esse mandamus.

[36] *Cod. Theod.* XVI. 2, 45, and *Cod. Justin.* I. 2, 6: *Theodosius Aug. Philippo Pf. P. Illyrici* (A. D. 421). Omni innovatione cessante, vetustatem et canones pristinos ecclesiasticos, qui nunc usque tenuerunt, per omnes Illyrici

Another opportunity of extending the power of the Roman bishops, offered itself in Gaul.[37] The distribution of the metropolitans, which had been made in that country at the end of the fourth century,[38] was at first conducted on the Oriental principle, the bishop of the largest city becoming the head of the diocese.[39] This principle had long been combated in vain by the bishop of Arelate, who, as the successor of an Apostle, of course favored the other principle of precedence. At last he made application at Rome, and the opportunity was joyfully embraced by Zosimus (A. D. 417), to declare Patroclus, bishop of Arelate, his vicar in Gaul, investing him with the metropolitan rights in the provinces Viennensis and Narbonensis prima and secunda.[40] The

---

provincias servari præcipimus: ut si quid dubietatis emerserit, id oporteat non absque scientia viri reverendissimi sacrosanctæ legis antistitis urbis Constantinopolitanæ, quæ Romæ veteris prærogativa lætatur, conventui sacerdotali sanctoque judicio reservari. At the representation of Honorius (see *Honorii Ep. ad Theodos. Aug.* amongst the letters of Boniface I. *Coustant*, Ep. 10.), Theodosius II. soon repealed that law (*Theodosii Ep. ad Honorium*, ibid. Ep. 11.): omni supplicantium Episcoporum per Illyricum subreptione remota, statuimus observari quod prisca apostolica disciplina et canones veteres eloquuntur. It is remarkable that this law is found in both Codices, but the repeal in neither. The Roman bishops were compelled to be continually exhorting the Illyrian bishops to obey the bishop of Thessalonica, cf. *Bonifacii* I. *Ep.* 14 *ad Episcopos per Thessal. Ep.* 15 *ad Episc. per Macedoniam, Achajam, etc.* — *Sixti* III. *Ep.* 7 *ad Perigenem Episc. Corinth. Ep.* 8 *ad Synod. Thessalonicæ congregandam.* — *Leonis* I. *Ep.* 5 *ad Episc. Metropolitanos per Illyricum constitutos. Ep.* 13 *ad eosdem.*

[37] Concerning the Vicariatus Arelatensis, see *de Marca* (Baluzius) l. c. Lib. V. c. 30 — c. 41.

[38] Comp. the observatt. ad Quesnelli diss. V. P. II. in Ballerini's ed. of the Opp. Leonis Tom. II. p. 1030 seq. Zieglers Gesch. d. kirchl. Verfassungsformen S. 79 ff.

[39] *Conc. Taurinense ann.* 401 (according to Baronius, but erroneously, ann. 397) *can* 2: Illud deinde inter Episcopos urbium Arelatensis et Viennensis, qui de primatus apud nos honore certabant, a S. Synodo definitum est, ut qui ex eis approbaverit suam civitatem esse metropolim, is totius provinciæ honorem primatus obtineat.

[40] *Zosimi Ep.* 1 *ad Episc. Galliæ:* Placuit apostolicæ sedi, ut si quis ex qualibet Galliarum parte, sub quolibet ecclesiastico gradu, ad nos Romam venire contendit, vel alio terrarum ire disponit, non aliter proficiscatur, nisi metropolitani Arelatensis Episcopi formatas acceperit. — Quisquis igitur — prætermissa supradicti formata — ad nos venerit, sciat se omnino suscipi non posse. — Jussimus autem præcipuam, sicuti semper habuit, metropolitanus Episcopus Arelatensium civitatis in ordinandis sacerdotibus teneat auctoritatem. Viennensem, Narbonensem primam et Narbonensem secundam provincias ad pontificium suum revocet. Quisquis vero posthac contra apostolicæ sedis statuta et precepta majorum, omisso metropolitano Episcopo, in provinciis supradictis quemquam ordinare præsumserit, vel is qui ordinari se illicite siverit, uterque sacerdotio se carere cognoscat. — Sane quoniam metropolitanæ Arelatensium urbi vetus privilegium minime derogandum est, ad quam primum ex hac sede Trophimus summus antistes, ex cujus fonte totæ Galliæ fidei rivulos acceperunt, directus est; idcirco quascunque parœcias in quibuslibet territoriis, etiam extra provincias suas, ut antiquitus habuit intemerata auctoritate possideat. Ad cujus notitiam, si quid illic negotiorum emerserit, referri censemus, nisi magnitudo causæ etiam nostrum exquirat examen. *Ejusd. Ep.* 5 *ad Episc. Prov. Vienn. et Narbon.* rejects the decision of the Synod Taurin, as obtained by unfair means: Indecens ausus et in ipso vestibulo resecandus, hoc ab Episcopis ob certas causas concilium agitantibus extorquere, quod contra patrum et s. Trophimi reverentiam, qui primus metropolitanus

offended metropolitans of Vienna, Narbo, and Massilia refused, however, notwithstanding the threats of the Roman bishop, to accede to this arrangement; and shortly after (A. D. 418) Arelate having been made the chief city of seven provinces (Septimana),[41] and its bishop attempting to extend his sway over them all, it became once more the interest of the Roman bishops to take part with the old metropolitans.[42] The bishop of Arelate finally so far forgot his duty as vicar of the Roman bishop, that he would not allow the sentence he had pronounced against Chelidonius, bishop of Vesontio, to be reëxamined at Rome.[43] For this contumacy, Leo the Great (A. D. 445) deprived

---

Arelatensis civitatis ex hac sede directus est, *concedere vel mutare ne hujus quidem sedis possit auctoritas.* These pretensions of the church at Arles, answered below by Leo I. note 44.

[41] *Honorii constitutio* ap. Sirmond. in notis ad Sidonium Apoll. and in *Codicis Theodosiani* libb. V. *priores ed. C. F. Chr. Wenck Lips.* 1825. 8vo. p. 378 seq. cf. p. 371 seq.

[42] The clergy and people of Lutuba having complained to Boniface I. that Patroclus had forced a bishop upon them against their will, he wrote *Epist.* 12 *ad Hilarium Ep. Narbon.* A. D. 422: Quod nequaquam possumus ferre patienter: quia convenit nos paternarum sanctionum diligentes esse custodes. Nulli etenim videtur incognita synodi constitutio Nicænæ, quæ ita præcipit, per unamquamque provinciam jus metropolitanos singulos habere debere, nec cuiquam quas esse subjectas. — Unde, frater carissime, si ita res sunt, et ecclesiam supradictam provinciæ tuæ limes includit, nostra auctoritate commonitus, quod quidem facere sponte deberes, desideriis supplicantium et voluntate respecta, ad eundem locum, in quo ordinatio talis celebrata dicitur, metropolitani jure munitus, et præceptionibus nostris fretus, accede: intelligens arbitrio tuo secundum regulas patrum quæcunque facienda sunt a nobis esse concessa; ita ut peractis omnibus, apostolicæ sedi quidquid statueris te referente clarescat, cui totius provinciæ ordinationem liquet esse mandatam. Nemo ergo eorum [patrum] terminos audax temerator excedat. — Cesset hujusmodi pressa nostra auctoritate præsumtio eorum, qui ultra licitum suæ limitem dignitatis extendunt. So too *Cælestinus Ep.* 4 *ad Episc. Prov. Vienn. et Narbon.* A. D. 428.

[43] *Vita Hilarii Arelat. by Honoratus Ep. Massil.* (about A. D. 490. in *Surius* and *Acta* SS. *ad* d. 5 *Maji)* § 22: Hilarius went himself to Rome, and reminded Leo, aliquos (Chelidonius, &c.) apud Gallias publicam merito excepisse sententiam, et in urbe sacris altaribus interesse. Rogat atque constringit, ut si suggestionem suam libenter excepit, secreto jubeat emendari; se ad officia non ad causam venisse; protestandi ordine non accusandi, quæ sunt acta suggerere: porro autem si aliud velit, non futurum esse molestum. Et quia tantorum virorum, præsertim jam ad supernam gratiam vocatorum, nec in narratione audeo judicia ventilare; hoc breviter tetigisse sufficiet, quod solus tantos sustinuit, quod nequaquam minantes expavit, quod inquirentes edocuit, quod altercantes vicit, quod potentibus non cessit, quod in discrimine vitæ positus communioni ejus, quem cum tantis viris damnaverat, conjungi nullatenus acquievit. *Auxiliaris tunc Præfectus* wrote to him: Sanctos Nectarium et Constantium sacerdotes ex beatitudinis tuæ parte venientes digna admiratione suscepi. Cum his sæpius sum locutus de virtute animi atque constantia, contemptuque rerum humanarum, quo inter fragilitates nostras semper beatus es. — Locutus sum etiam cum S. Papa Leone. Hoc loco, credo aliquantum animo perhorrescis. Sed cum propositi tui tenax sis, et semper æqualis, nulloque commotionis felle rapiaris, sicut nullis extolleris illecebris gaudiorum, ego nec minimum quidem factum Beatitudinis tuæ arrogantiæ meminii contagione fuscari. *Sed impatienter ferunt homines, si sic loquamur, quomodo nobis conscii sumus. Aures præterea Romanorum quadam teneritudine plus trahuntur: in quam si se Sanctitas tua subinde demittat, plurimum tu, nihil perditurus, acquiris.* Da mihi hoc, et exiguas nubes parvæ mutationis serenitate compesce.

him of all the privileges which had been granted his predecessor,[44] but could not prevent him and his successors from asserting their claims to the metropolitan dignity.[45]

The ambitious attempts of the Roman bishops were least successful in Africa, where the various relations within the church had long been fixed, and the government of the church a favorite subject of study.[46] As early as the Pelagian controversy, Zosimus had learned by experience how little his decisions were respected in the African church (p. 220, 221). By palming upon them the decrees of the council of Sardica for those of the council of Nice, he succeeded, indeed, in prevailing on them to receive again the deposed presbyter Apiarius; but for this imposture his successor Boniface I. (A. D. 418–423) had to submit to the most cutting reproaches.[47] And when Celestinus I. (A. D. 423–432) ventured again to urge the restoration of Apiarius to office, the African bishops most expressly declined his interference, forbidding all appeals of their clergy to foreign bishops.[48] This

---

[44] *Leonis M. Ep.* 10. *(al. 89) ad Episc. Provinciæ Viennensis* c. 4: quid sibi Hilarius quærit in aliena provincia: et id quod nullus decessorum ipsius ante Patroclum habuit, quid usurpat? cum et ipsum, quod Patroclo a Sede Apostolica temporaliter videbatur esse concessum, postmodum sit sententia meliore sublatum? — *cap.* 7: Suis unaquæque provincia sit contenta Conciliis, nec ultra Hilarius audeat conventus indicere synodales, et sacerdotum Domini Judicia se interserendo turbare. Qui non tantum noverit se ab alieno jure depulsum, sed etiam Viennensis provinciæ, quam male usurpaveret, potestate privatum. Dignum est enim, fratres, antiquitatis statuta reparari, cum is, qui sibi ordinationem provinciæ indebitæ vindicabat, talis in præsenti etiam probatus fuerit extitisse, ut — suæ tantum civitatis illi sacerdotium, pro Sedis apostolicæ pietate, præceptio nostra servaverit.

[45] See *de Marca* l. c. Lib. V. c. 33.

[46] Concerning the so-called *Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Africanæ* (ed. in *Voëlli et Justelli bibl. jur. Can. vet.* T. I. p. 320 in *Mansi* III. p. 699 seq.) compiled by Dionisius Exiguus from the Acta of the *Syn. Carthag. ann.* 419, at which the decrees of former councils were confirmed, and new ones added, see *Gallandii de vetustis canonum collectionibus sylloge*, especially the Essay of *Coustant*, c. 6 (ed Mogont. T. I. p. 103), *P. de Marca* c. 4 (*ibid.* p. 180) *Ballerini* P. II. c. 3 (*ibid.* p. 334).

[47] *Conc. Afric. Ep. ad Bonifac.* A. D. 419 (Coustant Epist. Bonif. II.): § 5. Hæc (the decrees of the Council of Sardica) utique usque ad adventum verissimorum exemplarium Nicæni Concilii inserta gestis sunt. Quæ si ibi — continerentur, eoque ordine vel apud vos in Italia custodirentur; nullo modo nos talia, qualia commemorare jam nolumus, vel tolerare cogeremur, vel intolerabilia pateremur. Sed credimus — quod tua Sanctitate Romanæ ecclesiæ presidente non sumus jam istum typhum passuri; et servabuntur erga nos, quæ nobis etiam non disserentibus custodiri debeant cum fraterna caritate, quæ secundum sapientiam atque justitiam, quam tibi donavit Altissimus, etiam ipse perspicis esse servanda, nisi forte aliter se habeant canones Concilii Nicæni. — This mistake was favoured by the form of the collection of Canons then in use, in which the canons of the Council of Nice were followed by those of the other Councils, without any distinguishing mark. Quesnell has annexed such a collection to his edition of the Opera Leonis: also *Mansi* VI. p. 1183. Hence the canons of other councils are often cited as those of the Council of Nice. See *Ballerini de ant. collect. cann.* P. II. c. 1, § 3 (in Gallandii syll. ed Mogont. T. I. p. 311). Spittler in Meusels Geschichtsforscher. Th. 4, S. 72 ff. Dess. Gesch. d. Kan. Rechts. S. 106.

[48] *Concil. Milevitani* II. (ann. 416) *can.* 22 (in fact the decree of a later council): Item placuit, ut presbyteri, diaconi, vel ceteri inferiores clerici, in causis quas hubuerint, si de judiciis episcoporum suorum questi fuerint, vicini

period closes with Leo the Great, bishop of Rome (A. D. 440 – 461). By exalting the authority of the apostle Peter,[49] and tracing all his rights to this source,[50] as well as by his personal qualities and good

---

episcopi eos audiant, et inter eos quidquid est, finiant, adhibiti ab eis ex consensu episcoporum suorum. Quod si et ab iis provocandum putaverint, non provocent nisi ad Africana concilia, vel ad primates provinciarum suarum, [aut ad universale concilium, sicut et de Episcopis sæpe constitutum est]. *Ad transmarina autem qui putaverit appellandum, a nullo intra Africam in communionem suscipiatur.* This canon is also contained in the *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.* cap. 28 and 125. The clause, sicut et de Episcopis sæpe constitutum est, is found only in *cap.* 28. In defence of its genuineness *de Marca* Lib. VII. c. 16 § 5. — *Conc. Afric. ad Cœlestinum* A. D. 425 (Coustant Epist. Cœlest. II.): § 2. Præfato itaque debitæ salutationis officio, impendio deprecamur, ut deinceps ad vestras aures hinc venientes non facilius admittatis, nec a nobis excommunicatos in communionem ultra velitis excipere: quia hoc etiam Nicæno concilio definitum facile advertat venerabilitas tua. Nam et si de inferioribus clericis vel de laicis videtur ibi præcaveri, quanto magis hoc de episcopis voluit observari? ne in sua provincia a communione suspensi, a tua sanctitate præpropere vel indebite videantur communioni restitui. § 3. Presbyterorum quoque et sequentium clericorum improba refugia, sicuti te dignum est, repellat sanctitas tua: quia et nulla patrum definitione hoc ecclesiæ derogatum est Africanæ, et decreta Nicæna sive inferioris gradus clericos, sive ipsos episcopos suis metropolitanis apertissime commisserunt. Prudentissime enim justissimeque viderunt, quæcunque negotia in suis locis, ubi orta sunt, finienda, nec unicuique provinciæ gratiam sancti Spiritus defuturam, qua æquitas a Christi sacerdotibus et prudenter videatur, et constantissime teneatur: maxime quia unicuique concessum est, si judicio offensus fuerit cognitorum, ad concilia suæ provinciæ vel etiam universale provocare. Nisi forte quisquam est qui credat, unicuilibet posse Deum nostrum examinis inspirare justitiam, et innumerabilibus congregatis in concilium sacerdotibus denegare. Aut quomodo ipsum transmarinum judicium ratum erit, ad quod testium necessariæ personæ vel propter sexus vel propter senectutis infirmitatem, vel multis aliis intercurrentibus impedimentis, adduci non poterunt? § 4. Nam ut aliqui tanquam a tuæ sanctitatis latere mittantur, in nulla invenimus patrum synodo constitutum; quia illud quod pridem per eundem coëpiscopum nostrum Faustinum tanquam ex parte Nicæni concilii exinde transmisistis, in conciliis verioribus, quæ accipiuntur Nicæna, a. S. Cyrillo coëpiscopo nostro Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ, et a venerabili Attico Constantinopolitano antistite ex authentico missis — non potuimus reperire. § 5. Exsecutores etiam clericos vestros quibusque petentibus nolite mittere, nolite concedere; ne fumosum typhum sæculi in ecclesiam Christi — videamur inducere. cf. *du Pin de ant. disc. eccl. diss.* II. § 3, p. 174 seq.

[49] See the characteristic expression of the prefect Auxiliaris concerning the tenerítudo aurium of the Romans, note 43 above.

[50] *Leonis Ep.* 10 (*al.* 89) *ad Episc. Provinciæ Viennensis:* Divinæ cultum religionis — ita Dominus noster instituit, ut veritas — per apostolicam tubam in salutem universitatis exiret. — Sed hujus muneris sacramentum ita Dominus ad omnium Apostolorum officium pertinere voluit, ut in beatissimo Petro Apostolorum omnium summo, principaliter collocaret; et ab ipso quasi quodam capite, dona sua velit in corpus omne manare: ut exsortem se mysterii intelligeret esse divini, qui ausus fuisset a Petri soliditate recedere. Hunc enim in consortium individuæ unitatis assumptum, id quod ipse erat, voluit nominari, dicendo: *Tu es Petrus,* etc. ut æterni templi ædificatio, mirabili munere gratiæ Dei, in Petri soliditate consisteret. Hence *Epist. ad Anastasium* (Quesn. ep. 12. Baller. 14) c. 1: Curam, quam universis ecclesiis principaliter ex divina institutione debemus. c. 11: magna ordinatione provisum est, ne omnes (episcopi) sibi omnia vindicarent; sed essent in singulis provinciis singuli, quorum inter fratres haberetur prima sententia, et rursus quidam, in majoribus urbibus constituti, sollicitudinem susciperent ampliorem, per quos ad unam Petri sedem universalis ecclesiæ cura confluereret, et nihil usquam a suo capite dissideret. *Epist. ad Africanos* (Quesn. 1. Baller 12.) sollicitudo, quam universæ ecclesiæ ex divina institutione dependimus.

fortune, he did more than any of his predecessors in extending and confirming the power of the Roman see. The controversy with Hilarius, bishop of Arelate, led him to obtain a decree from Valentinian III. (A. D. 445), by which the Roman bishop was made the head of the whole Western church.[51] The catholic bishops of Africa, oppressed by the Arians, were now more willing to acknowledge the authority of the Roman bishop, and allowed Leo the undisputed rights of a patriarch in their churches.[52] But all this only contributed to make him feel it more acutely, when the council of Chalcedon, proceeding on the principle that the importance of a bishop depended alone on the political consequence of the city in which he lived, decreed the same rights to the bishop of Constantinople in the Eastern church, which the bishop of Rome enjoyed in the Western. This measure Leo had foreseen, and in vain attempted to prevent through his legates. He now protested himself against it;[53] and the bishop of Constantinople was actually forced, for his emperor's sake, to write to Leo in a submissive strain.[54] Still the decree of the synod remained in full force, and thus began the long contest of jealousy between the bishops of Rome and Constantinople.

It ought here to be noticed that the bishop of Rome had as yet no peculiar title in the West. In the East, the titles appropriate to the patriarchs were extended to him; but in the West these titles were given to all bishops indiscriminately.[55]

---

[51] Gothofred, Ritter Novell. Theodosii Tit. 24, in Hugo Novell. Valent. Tit. 17. In Leo opp. ed. Baller. epist. 11. — Cum igitur sedis apostolicæ primatum sancti Petri meritum, qui princeps est episcopalis coronæ, et Romanæ dignitas civitatis, sacræ etiam synodi firmarit auctoritas, ne quid præter auctoritatem sedis istius illicita præsumptio attentare nitatur. Tunc enim demum ecclesiarum pax ubique servabitur, si rectorem suum agnoscat universitas. — § 3. Nec hoc solum, quod est maximi criminis submovemus, verum ne levis saltem inter ecclesias turba nascatur, vel in aliquo minui religionis disciplina videatur, hac perenni sanctione censemus, ne quid tam episcopis Gallicanis, quam aliorum provinciarum contra consuetudinem veterem liceat sine viri venerabilis papæ urbis æternæ auctoritate tentare. Sed hoc illis omnibusque pro lege sit, quidquid sanxit vel sanxerit apostolicæ sedis auctoritas, ita ut, quisquis episcoporum ad judicium Romani antistitis evocatus venire neglexerit, per moderatorem ejusdem provinciæ adesse cogatur, per omnia servatis, quæ divi parentes nostri Romanæ ecclesiæ detulerunt.

[52] cf. *Leonis* epist. ad Episc. African. (Quesn. 1 Baller 12).

[53] *Leonis* epist. ad *Marcianum*, ad *Pulcheriam*, ad *Anatolium* (Quesn. ep. 78 – 80. Baller. ep. 104 – 106).

[54] In *Epistt. Leonis* Quesn. annexed to epist. 105, Baller. ep. 132.

[55] The names, *Papa*, *Apostolicus*, *Vicarius Christi*, *Summus Pontifex*, *Sedes Apostolica*, were applied to other bishops, as well as the bishop of Rome (*Thomassini* P. I. lib. 1, c. 4. *Basnage* præf. ad Canisii lectt. ant. T. I. p. 37. C. S. Cyprians Belehrung vom Ursprung u. Wachsthum d. Papsthums S. 506 ff.). Also *Patriarcha*, especially to the Metropolitans (*du Pin* diss. I. § 5). — Gregory I. (Epist. lib. V. 20, VIII. 30,) is mistaken in saying that the name of universalis episcopus, also, was given to the bishop of Rome at the Council of Chalcedon. This name is given him only in the accusations against Dioscurus by two Alexandrian deacons (Mansi T. VI. p. 1006, 1012), as to other Patriarchs (vid. § 91, note 17). In another place the title was surreptitiously introduced by the Roman legates into the Latin translation of the Acts of the council. In passing sentence upon Dioscurus, *Actio* III. (*Mansi* VI. p. 1048) the council say ὁ ἁγιώτατος καὶ

CHAPTER FOURTH.

HISTORY OF MONACHISM.

Rud. Hospiniani de Monachis h. e. de origine et progressu monachatus libb. VI. Tiguri 1588. ed. II. auct. 1609. Genev. 1669. fol. — *Ant. Dadini Alteserræ* Asceticῶν s. origg. rei monasticæ libb. X. Paris 1674. 4to. rec. ac præf. notasque adjecit *Chr. F. Glück.* Halæ. 1782. 8vo. — *Edm. Martene* de antiquis monachorum ritibus. Lugd. 1690. 4to. — *J. Binghami* origg. lib. VII. (vol. III. p. 1 seq.) — *Hippol. Helyot* histoire des ordres monastiques, etc. Paris 1714 – 19. T. VIII. 4to. German: Ausführl. Gesch. aller geistl. u. weltl. Kloster, u. Ritterorden, &c. Leipzig. 1753 – 56. 8 Bde. 4to. — (Musson) Pragm. Gesch. d. vornehmsten Mönchsorden a. ihren eigenen Geschichtschreibern (Paris, 1751 seq.) i. e. deutschen Ausg. (v. L. G. Crome) m. e. Vorrede v. Th. W. Fr. Walch. Leipzig 1774 – 84. 10 Bde. 8vo. (Die Möncherey oder geschichtl. Darstellung der Klosterwelt. Stuttgart. 1819 ff. 3 Bde. 8vo. — Gesch des Benedictinerordens. Vorher als Einleit. eine kurze oriental. Mönchsgeschichte (aus Spittlers Vorles.) herausgeg. v. J. Gurlitt. Hamburg. 1823. 4to. Neander's Kirchengesch, II. 2, 486 ff.

§ 93.

ORIGIN AND HISTORY OF MONACHISM IN THE EAST.

Antony (see § 71) soon found many imitators, and other hermits fixed themselves in his neighbourhood. Many more were concealed in inaccessible places, of whom one, Paul of Thebes († A. D. 340), who had lived in the desert ever since the Decian persecution, became known to Antony just before his death.[1] After a kind of connexion had thus been established amongst a number of hermits, *Pachomius*, one of the pupils of Antony, founded the first cloister on the island Tabenna, in the year 340 (*κοινόβιον. μάνδρα.* claustrum —); with a system of rules for the government of its inmates, by which obedience to their head (*Ἀββᾶς. Ἡγούμενος. Ἀρχιμανδρίτης*) was especially enforced. At the same time *Ammon* founded a society of monks on the Nitrian mountain (*τὸ τῆς Νιτρίας ὄρος*) which afterwards

---

μακαριώτατος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος τῆς μεγάλης καὶ πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης Λέων: whilst in the Latin translation, which Leo sent to the bishops in Gaul (*Leonis Ep.* 103. *al.* 82) we read: Sanctus et beatissimus Papa, caput universalis Ecclesiæ, Leo. In the older edd. the beginning of Leon epist. 97 (Quesn. 134, Baller. 165) runs thus: Leo Romæ et universalis catholicæque ecclesiæ Episcopus Leoni semper Augusto salutem. Quesnel and the Ballerini, however, find in all the codices only: *Leo episcopus Leoni Augusto.* The fable that Cyril, at the Council of Ephesus, called the bishop of Rome *Archiepiscopum totius orbis terrarum Patrem et Patriarcham*, which is repeated even in the *Catechismus Romanus*, P. II. c. 7, *Qu.* 24, § 4, originated as late as the *catena aurea in Evang. ad Matth.* xvi. 18 of *St. Thomæ* († 1274), in which many similar passages are falsely attributed to the Greek fathers, see. *Launoji Epistt.* Lib. I. *Ep.* 1 – 3.

[1] Vita Antonii by Athanasius, see § 71, note 15. Vita Pauli by Jerome.

became one of their most celebrated resorts. A company of monks was assembled in the desert near Gaza, by *Hilarion*, and from thence they spread themselves through Palestine and Syria.[2] Monks were first introduced into Armenia and Asia Minor,[3] by the Eusebian *Eustathius*, afterwards bishop of Sebaste. The distinguishing characteristics of the monks were a solitary life, manual labor, spiritual exercises, and abstinence even from the necessaries of life; that so the sensual part of their nature might be weakened, and the mind undisturbed in the contemplation of heavenly things.[4] The rules of the convents did not indeed demand all this,[5] but for the most part they voluntarily went beyond the rules, and even withdrew into the deserts (Ἀναχωρηταί), that they might attain greater holiness by the ingenuity of their self-torture. This solitude, united with extreme weakness of body and the influence of the burning climate, must of course have acted on the imagination,[6] and we cannot be surprised therefore at any thing, however extravagant, which we may read in their history; especially when we remember how much has probably been added by the traditions of superstitious admirers.[7]

---

[2] Vita Hilarionis by Jerome — Παύραι in Palestine.

[3] Concerning these first monks, see Socrates IV. 23, 24. Sozomenus I. 12–14. III. 14. VI. 28–34. *Palladii* (bishop of Helenopolis then of Aspona, † about 420) historia Lausiaca. *Theodoreti* φιλόθεος ἱστορία.

[4] Concerning the Egyptian convents, see *Hieronymi Ep.* 18 (*al.* 22) *ad Eustochium* (ed. Martian. T. IV. P. II. p. 45) *Jo. Cassiani collationes Patrum*, and *de institutis cænobiorum.* Of the labor to which they subjected themselves he says, cf. de inst. cœn. X. 23: Hæc est apud Ægyptum ab antiquis patribus sancita sententia: operantem monachum dæmone uno pulsari, otiosum vero innumeris spiritibus devastari cf. *Alteserra* l. c. lib. V. cap. 7 et 8. Neanders Chrysostomus Bd. I. S. 80 ff.

[5] In Pachomius' rules (Pallad. hist. Laus. c. 38) we find: Συγχωρήσις ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν φαγεῖν καὶ πιεῖν· καὶ πρὸς τὰς δυνάμεις τῶν ἐσθιόντων ἀνάλογα καὶ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν ἐγχείρησον, καὶ μήτε νηστεῦσαι κωλύσῃς μήτε φαγεῖν.

[6] *Hieronymi* Ep. 95 (al. 4) *ad Rusticum:* Sunt, qui humore cellarum, immoderatisque jejunis, tædio solitudinis ac nimia lectione, dum diebus ac noctibus auribus suis personant, vertuntur in melancholiam, et Hippocratis magis fomentis quam nostris monitis indigent. *Ejusd. Ep.* 97 (*al.* 8) *ad Demetriadem:* Novi ego in utroque sexu per nimiam abstinentiam cerebri sanitatem quibusdam fuisse vexatam: præcipueque in his, qui in humectis et frigidis habitaverunt cellulis, ita ut nescirent quid agerent, quove se verterent: quid loqui, quid tacere deberent. Hence he disapproves of extreme fasting, *ep.* 57 (*al.* 7) *ad Lætam* and *Jo. Cassian. instit.* V. 9. In explanation of the frequent visions seen by these Anchorites, see D. Joh. Müller über die phantastischen Gesichtserscheinungen, eine physiolog. Untersuchung. Coblenz. 1826, 8vo.

[7] Some hints on this subject may be found in the following passages: *Hieron. Ep.* 59 *ad Rusticum:* quosdam ineptos homines dæmonum pugnantium contra se portenta confingere, ut apud imperitos et vulgi homines miraculum sui faciant, et exinde lucra sectentur. *Sozomenus* I. 14: πολλὰ δὲ καὶ θεσπίσια ἐπ' αὐτῷ (Ἀμοῦν) συμβέβηκεν, ἃ μάλιστα τοῖς κατ' Αἴγυπτον μοναχοῖς ἠκρίβωται, περὶ πολλοῦ ποιουμένοις, διαδοχῇ παραδόσεως ἀγράφου ἐπιμελῶς ἀπομνημονεύειν τὰς τῶν παλαιοτέρων ἀσκητῶν ἀρετάς. *Sulpicius Severus dial.* II. 4, relates that St. Martin often said to him, *nequaquam sibi in episcopatu eam virtutum gratiam suppetisse, quam prius se habuisse meminisset.* Quod si verum est, immo quia verum est, conjicere possumus, quanta fuerunt illa, quæ monachus operatus est, et quæ teste nullo solus exercuit, cum tanta illum in episcopatu signa fecisse, sub oculis omnium viderimus.

For in the East, monachism was received with the most enthusiastic admiration, and the number of monks soon became enormous.[8] As there were no more persecutions, and no opportunity of martyrdom, a mistaken notion was abroad that in the world there was no longer any opportunity for the exercise of perfect Christian virtue. At the same time many were driven into the desert by the general corruption of the age, or by consciousness of individual guilt; and very many became monks only from imitation, and even from less worthy motives.[9] The measures taken by the emperor Valens to counteract this tendency to monachism were made fruitless by the superstition of his successors. The most distinguished teachers in the church, Athanasius, Ambrosius, Basilius the Great, Gregory of Naziantium, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine, were the zealous advocates of the new mode of life (*φιλοσοφία, ἀγγελικὴ διαγωγὴ*).[11] Examples in point were found in the Old Testament,[12] and by new explanations of detached passages and the help of legends, the life

---

[8] Pachomius had in his convent more than 1300 monks, and in all more than 7000 under his superintendence (Sozom. 3, 14). In one convent in Thebais there were 5000 monks (Cass. de instit. IV. 1); in Nitria there were fifty convents (Sozom. 6, 31).

[9] Comp. what Synesius, at that time an Heathen, afterwards bishop of Ptolemais, says in his Dion: *οἱ δὲ πλείους οὐδ' οἴκοθεν ἐκινήθησαν, — ὥσπερ δὲ ἄλλό τι τῶν εὐδοκιμούντων, τὴν γενναίαν αἵρεσιν ἐζηλώκασι, παντοδαποί τε ὄντες τὰ γένη, καὶ κατὰ χρείαν ἕκαστοι συνιστάμενοι.*

[10] *Cod. Theodos.* XII. 1, 63 (A. D. 365): Quidam ignaviæ sectatores desertis civitatum muneribus captant solitudines ac secreta, et specie religionis cum cœtibus monazonton congregantur. Hos igitur atque hujusmodi, intra Ægyptum deprehensos, per comitem Orientis erui e latebris consulta præceptione mandavimus, atque ad munia patriarum subeunda revocari, aut pro tenore nostræ sanctionis familiarium rerum carere illecebris, quas per eos censuimus vindicandas, qui publicarum essent subituri munera functionum. *Hieron. chron.* ann. 736: multi monachorum Nitriæ per tribunos et milites cæsi. Valens enim lege data, ut monachi militarent, nolentes fustibus interfici jussit (*Oros.* hist. VII. 33, illico post fratris obitum).

[11] *ὁ τῶν ἀγγέλων βίος· τὰ οὐράνια πολιτεύματα.* The taking a monk's vows is called by *Hieron. Ep.* 22 (*al* 25) *ad Paulum* secundo quodammodo propositi se baptismo lavare.

[12] *Hieronymus in vita S. Pauli* (about A. D. 365): Inter multos sæpe dubitatum est, a quo potissimum Monachorum eremus habitari cœpta sit. Quidam enim altius repetentes, a. b. Elia et Johanne sumsere principium. Quorum et Elias plus nobis videtur fuisse, quam Monachus: et Johannes ante prophetare cœpisse, quam natus sit. Alii autem, in quam opinionem vulgus omne consentit, asserunt Antonium hujus propositi caput, quod ex parte verum est. Non enim tam ipse ante omnes fuit, quam ab eo omnium incitata sunt studia. Amathas vero et Macarius, discipuli Antonii, e quibus superior magistri corpus sepelivit, etiam nunc affirmant, Paulum quemdam Thebæum principem istius rei fuisse, non nominis; quam opinionem nos quoque probamus. 395 *Ep.* 49. (*al.* 13) *ad Paulinum:* Nos autem habeamus propositi nostri principes Paulos et Antonios, Julianos, Hilarionem, Macarios. Et ut ad scripturarum auctoritatem redeam: noster princeps Helias, noster Helisæus, nostri duces filii prophetarum, qui habitabant in agris et solitudinibus, et faciebant sibi tabernacula prope fluenta Jordanis. De his sunt et illi filii Rechab (*Jerem.* xxxv.), qui vinum et siceram non bibebant, qui morabantur in tentoriis etc. *Sozomenus* I. 12, *ταύτης δὲ τῆς ἀρίστης φιλοσοφίας ἤρξατο, ὥς τινες λέγουσιν, Ἠλίας ὁ προφήτης, καὶ Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής·*

of the early Christians was made out to have been precisely that of the monks.[13]

But the passions of these men, cut off from their natural vents, burst forth in other forms, especially in spiritual pride[14] and wild fanaticism against all who differed from them in opinion. There were frequent instances of individuals appearing in the cities to oppose heathen and heretics, and returning again to their solitude.[15]

The first permanent monastic establishment for the overthrow of heretics was formed by Basil the Great, near New Cæsarea, to turn

---

[13] The Therapeutæ were brought forward as Christians (see § 17, note 7) appealing to Act. ii. 44; iv. 32 seq. *Hieron. Catal.* c. 11. Philo — librum de prima Marci Evangelistæ apud Alexandriam scribens ecclesia, in nostrorum laude versatus est (meaning Philo περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ); non solum eos ibi, sed in multis quoque provinciis esse commemorans, et habitacula eorum dicens monasteria. Ex quo apparet, talem primam Christo credentium fuisse ecclesiam, quales nunc monachi esse nituntur et cupiunt, ut nihil cujuspiam proprium sit, nullus inter eos dives, nullus pauper: patrimonia egentibus dividuntur, orationi vacatur et psalmis, doctrinæ quoque et continentiæ: quales et Lucas refert primum Hierosolymæ fuisse credentes. *Jo. Cassian.* collat. 18, c. 5.: Itaque Cœnobitarum disciplina a tempore prædicationis Apostolicæ sumpsit exordium. Nam talis extitit in Hierosolymis omnis illa credentium multitudo, quæ in Actibus Apostolorum ita describitur (seqq. loca Act. iv. 32, 34, 35). — Sed cum post Apostolorum excessum tepescere cœpisset credentium multitudo, ea vel maxime, quæ ad fidem Christi de alienigenis ac diversis gentibus confluebat, — non solum hi qui ad fidem Christi confluxerant, verum etiam illi, qui erant ecclesiæ principes, ab illa districtione laxati sunt. — Hi autem, quibus adhuc Apostolicus inerat fervor, memores illius pristinæ perfectionis, discedentes a civitatibus suis — et ea, quæ ab Apostolis per universum corpus ecclesiæ generaliter meminerant instituta, privatim ac peculiariter exercere cœperunt, etc. *Idem de institut. Cœnob.* II. 5: Cum in primordiis fidei pauci quidem, sed probatissimi, monachorum nomine censerentur, qui sicut a beatæ memoriæ evangelista Marco, qui primus Alexandrinæ urbi Pontifex præfuit, normam suscepere vivendi, non solum illa magnifica retinebant, quæ primitus ecclesiam vel credentium turbas in Actibus Apostolorum legimus celebrasse, — verum etiam his multo sublimiora cumulaverant. cf. *Sozomenus* I. 12. Hence the monks were said Ἀποστολικὸν βίον βιοῦν *Epiphan.* hær. 61, § 4. — Legends of the monkish chastity of the saints: The misunderstanding of Exodus xiii. 1, (2 Macc. iii. 19?) gave birth to a tradition that there were in the temple virgins consecrated to God, amongst whom *Mary* grew up *(Epiphan. Ancorat. no.* 60, *Gregor. Nyss. orat. de sancta Christi nativitate)* in vows of perpetual virginity (*Augustinus de virginitate* c. 4). Her marriage with Joseph they suppose to have been only formal, he being eighty years old (Epiph. hær. 51. c. 10), according to Epiph. l. c. a widower, but according to Hieron. adv. Helvid. c. 9, an ascetic from his youth. cf. *J. A. Schmidii Prolusiones Marianæ* X. *cum præf. Moshemii. Helmst.* 1733, 4to. p. 21 seq. — 1 Cor. ix. 5, was supposed to refer to female friends of the Apostles (§ 27, note 3).

[14] *Hieronym. Ep.* 15, (*al.* 77) *ad Marcum:* Pudet dicere, de cavernis cellularum damnamus orbem, in sacco et cinere volutati de Episcopis sententiam ferimus. Quid facit sub tunica pœnitentis regius animus? Catenæ, sordes et comæ non sunt diadematis signa, sed fletus. *Idem Ep.* 95 (*al* 4) *ad Rusticum:* In solitudine cito subrepit superbia: et si parumper jejunaverit, hominemque non viderit, putat se alicujus esse momenti. Oblitusque sui unde, et quo venerit, intus corde, lingua foris vagatur. Judicat contra Apostoli voluntatem alienos servos: quo gula voluerit, porrigit manum: dormit quantum voluerit: nullum veretur: facit quod voluerit: omnes inferiores se putat: crebriusque in urbibus, quam in cellula est: et inter fratres simulat verecundiam, qui platearum turbis colliditur.

[15] Antony said: τοὺς μὲν ἰχθύας τὴν ὑγρὰν οὐσίαν τρέφειν· μοναχοῖς δὲ κόσμον φέρειν τὴν ἔρημον· ἐπίσης τὲ τοὺς μὲν ξηρᾶς ἀπτομένους τὸ ζῆν ἀπολιμπάνειν, τοὺς δέ την μοναστικὴν σεμνότητα ἀπολλύειν τοῖς ἄστεσι προσιόντας. *Sozom.* I. 13.

the people against Arianism.[16] From this time forth convents in the neighbourhood of cities became more frequent. On the other hand, as the monks were not as yet governed by strict laws, some of them chose to wander round the country in companies. Thus their influence on church and state became daily stronger, and at the same time more dangerous.

From the time of Theodosius I. the monks were engaged in persecuting the pagans with a fury truly savage;[17] and it was always in the same spirit that they mingled in the controversies within the church. As they despised learning, and founded their notions of orthodoxy on an obscure feeling of what was and what was not consistent with true piety,[18] it could not of course be difficult for the designing to excite their fanaticism for almost any view whatever. The ambitious bishops of Alexandria, Theophilus, Cyril, and Dioscurus knew well how to make use of them either to work upon the populace, or openly to attack their adversaries;[19] whilst the rude mass of the monks were as readily excited against a Chrysostom at the point of death,[20] as against idololaters and Arians. To them the laws of the state offered no barriers, and the dignity of magistrates no check.[21] They united religious fanaticism with a cynical indifference to all propriety or duty; and but too often their seeming piety was but a mask for indolence and vice.[22]

---

[16] *Socrates* IV. 21. *Gregor. Nazianz.* Orat. XX. *in laudem Basilii* p. 358: τοῦ τοίνυν ἐρημικοῦ βίου καὶ τοῦ μιγάδος μαχομένων πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὡς τὰ πολλὰ, καὶ διϊσταμένων, καὶ οὐδετέρου πάντως ἢ τὸ φαῦλον ἀνεπίμικτον ἔχοντος· ἀλλὰ τοῦ μὲν ἡσυχίου μὲν ὄντος μᾶλλον, καὶ καθεστηκότος, καὶ θεῷ συνάγοντος, οὐκ ἀτύφου δὲ διὰ τὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀβασάνιστον καὶ ἀσύγκριτον· τοῦ δὲ πρακτικωτέρου μὲν μᾶλλον καὶ χρησιμωτέρου, τὸ δὲ θορυβῶδες οὐ φεύγοντος· καὶ τούτους ἄριστα κατήλλαξεν ἀλλήλοις καὶ συνεκέρασεν· ἀσκητήρια καὶ μοναστήρια διεμάμενος μὲν, οὐ πόρρω δὲ τῶν κοινωνικῶν καὶ μιγάδων, οὐδὲ ὥσπερ τειχίῳ τινὶ μέσῳ ταῦτα διαλαβών, καὶ ἀπ' ἀλλήλων χωρίσας, ἀλλὰ πλησίον συνάψας καὶ διαζεύξας· ἵνα μήτε τὸ φιλόσοφον ἀκοινώνητον ᾖ, μήτε τὸ πρακτικὸν ἀφιλόσοφον· On the *Ascetica* of Basilius, divided generally into the ὅροι κατὰ πλάτος and ὅροι κατ' ἐπιτομὴν (monastic rules) vid. *Garnier* in præf. ad *Basil. Opp.* T. II. p. XXXIV. seq.

[17] Comp. *Libanius* (vid. § 76, note 6, above) *Zosimus* V. 23. *Eunapius* in vita Ædesii: Μοναχοὺς, ἀνθρώπους μὲν κατὰ τὸ εἶδος, ὁ δὲ βίος αὐτοῖς συώδης, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἐμφανὲς ἐπασχόν τε καὶ ἐποίουν μυρία κακὰ καὶ ἄφραστα. Ἀλλ' ὅμως τοῦτο μὲν εὐσεβὲς ἐδόκει τὸ καταφρονεῖν τοῦ θείου· τυραννικὴν γὰρ εἶχεν ἐξουσίαν τότε πᾶς ἄνθρωπος, μέλλειν φορῶν ἐσθῆτα, καὶ δημοσίᾳ βουλόμενος ἀσχημονεῖν.

[18] *Sozomenus* I. 12: ἡ τοιαύτη φιλοσοφία μαθημάτων μὲν πολλῶν καὶ διαλεκτικῆς τεχνολογίας ἀμελεῖ, ὡς περίεργον, καὶ τὴν ἐν τοῖς ἀμείνοσι σχολὴν ἀφιερουμένης, καὶ πρὸς τὸ βιοῦν ὀρθῶς οὐδὲν συλλαμβανομένης· μόνῃ δὲ φυσικῇ καὶ ἀπεριέργῳ φρονήσει παιδεύει τὰ παντελῶς κακίαν ἀναιροῦντα, ἢ μείονα ἐργαζόμενα. Hence the anthropomorphism so common amongst them.

[19] Witness the insurrection of the Anthropomorphists against Theophilus, Socrates VI. 7, of the Nitrian monks against Orestes in behalf of Cyril VII. 13. Destruction of a temple, *Ambrosius Epist.* 40 (*al.* 29) ad Thedosium.

[20] In Cæsarea, comp. Neander's Chrysost. Bd. 2. S. 238.

[21] They frequently interfered tumultuously in behalf of criminals, e. g. for certain disturbers of the public peace in Antioch. *Chrysost.* orat. 17 et 18 ad popul. Antioch. *Theodoreti* h. e. V. 19. — Law of Arcadius A. D. 398 (Cod. Theod. IX. 40, 16) see § 89, note 8.

[22] Comp. Neander's Chrysostom Bd. 2, S. 108 ff.

It could not well be but that the incessant occupation with religious subjects, the overstrained and exaggerated views, and the egregious self-conceit of the monks, joined with their utter want of mental discipline, must lead them occasionally to differ from the doctrines of the church.[23] The character of *Audius* in Mesopotamia, who separated from the church on account of its corruption, and founded a sect of monks (Audiani) about the year 340,[24] is worthy of all respect. But not so the *Messalians*, or *Εὐχῖται*,[25] mere fanatics, who also appeared in Mesopotamia in the year 360. These were wandering beggars, who supposed that sins might be blotted out by incessant prayer, whilst they undervalued all public worship, and were led by the grossness of their imagination to the most absurd notions. Even *Eustathius*, the founder of monachism in Armenia, was led to forbid wedlock, and was therefore condemned with his followers at the synod of Gangra (between A. D. 362 and 370).[26]

There were, however, the most different kinds of monastic life. Many of the monks (*Rhemoboth*, or *Sarabaitæ*)[27] still continued to live in the midst of society like the old Ascetics,[28] though these were held in least honor. Others wandered round in companies (*βοσκοὶ*).[29] Those who lived together in convents were called *Cœnobites*, each convent having its peculiar constitution. The most distinguished amongst them, ever since the 5th century, were the *Akœmetæ* (*ἀκοίμητοι*) or *Watchers*, for whom Studius founded a celebrated convent in Constantinople in the year 460.[30] But amongst the people the *Anchorites* were held in the highest repute; for they carried their folly the farthest, and vied with each other in inventing new modes

---

[23] Some, namely, were led to Anthropomorphism (see note 18) as for instance, Abraames (Theodoret hist. rel. c. 3, ed. Schulze, T. III. p. 1147) and the Audians: others to contempt of public worship and the sacraments, like Valens and Heron in Palladii hist. Lausiaca. c. 31 and 32, and the Messalians. A certain Ptolemy was led by his dreaming visions to absolute atheism (Palladius l. c. c. 33).

[24] *Epiphan.* hær. 70, cf. *Ancoratus* c. 14. *Theodoret.* h. e. IV. 9, hær. fab. comp. IV. 10. Walchs Ketzerhist. Th. 3. S. 300. They were Anthropomorphists and Quartodecimani (like Abraames Theodoret. hist. rel. c. 3, ed. Schulze, T. III. p. 1147).

[25] *Epiphan.* hær. 80, *Theodoret* h. e. IV. 10, hær. fab. IV. 11. Extracts in *Photius* cod. 52. Walch l. c. S. 481.

[26] The acts of this Synod (Mansi II. p. 1095) are the chief source for the knowledge of his doctrines. Socrat. II. 43. Sozom. IV. 24. Walch l. c. S. 536. Amongst these heretics is recorded: *πρεσβυτέρων γεγαμηκότων ὑπερφρονοῦντες, καὶ τῶν λειτουργιῶν τῶν ὑπ' αὐτῶν γινομένων μὴ ἀπτόμενοι.* On the other hand can. 4: *Εἴ τις διακρίνοιτο παρὰ πρεσβυτέρου γεγαμηκότος, ὡς μὴ χρῆναι λειτουργήσαντος αὐτοῦ προσφορᾶς μεταλαμβάνειν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.* Concerning the date of the Synod of Gangra, see *Ballerini de ant. collect. canonum* P. I. cap. 4, § 1.

[27] Concerning the former *Hieron. Ep.* 18, (al. 22) ad Eustochium, concerning the latter *Cassian collat.* XVIII. c. 4 and 7. *Walch de Sarabaitis* (Novi Commentarii Soc. Gotting. Tom. V. Comm. hist. p. 1 seq.)

[28] *Ambros. Sermo* 65, *Gregorii Naz. carm.* passim, see *Walch* l. c. p. 23 seq.

[29] Sozom. VI. 33. Evagr. I. 21.

[30] Nicephori hist. eccl. XV. 23. *J. J. Muller Studium cœnob. Constantinopol. ex monum. Byzantinis illustratum diss. Lips.* 1721. 4to.

of self-torture.[31] Simeon is thought to have reached the climax in this art, who from the year 420 lived on the top of a pillar in the neighbourhood of Antioch;[32] and was imitated by other pillar-saints (στηλῖται — *Stylites*) till after the beginning of the 12th century.

These modes of self-torture could not all be imitated by women, though there were convents for them as early as for the men (Ascetriæ, Monastriæ, Castimoniales, Sanctimoniales, Nonnæ).[33]

The intention of adopting a monastic life was publicly declared, and penance imposed on those who afterwards drew back; yet in certain cases it was considered not only possible, but even advisable so to retract.[34]

§ 94.

MONACHISM IN THE WEST.

Jo. Mabillon observ. de monachorum origine, statu et regulis in Occidente ante Benedictum (*Acta SS. Ord. Bened. Sæc.* I. *Præf.* p. 7.

Monachism was first introduced in the West by Athanasius, but

---

[31] For examples, see Sozom. VI. 28–34.

[32] Like the Heathen Φαλλοβατῖς near the temple at Hierapolis *Lucianus de Dea Syria*, c. 28, 29). Concerning Simeon, see *Theodoreti hist. relig.* c. 26, and his life by his scholar, Antony (in Act. SS. ad. d. 5 Jan.) and his contemporary Cosmas (in *Assemani Act. SS. Mart. Occid. et Orient.* P. II. p. 268). cf. *Stylitica; Simeonis Stylitæ senioris biographiam græcam* (more modern and derived from that of Antony), *junioris orationem græcam prim. ed. et illustr. H. N. Clausen* (in the *Miscellanea Hafniensia ed. F. Münter. Tom. II. Fasc.* 2 *Hafn.* 1824. 8vo. p. 227 seq.).

[33] The first was founded by Pachomius, Pallad. hist. Laus. c. 34 and 38. — *Nonna* (Hieron. Ep. 18 ad Eustoch.) νονίς (Pallad. l. c. c. 46) were names of honor, as for the monks *Nonnus* (Arnobius jun. in Psalm. 105 and 140), Egyptian for sanctus, castus, or, according to *Benedicti regula*, c. 63, paterna reverentia. The principal of the convent was called mother Ἄμμας (Pallad. l. c. c. 42).

[34] *Epiphan.* hær. 61, § 7: Κρεῖττον τοίνυν ἔχειν ἁμαρτίαν μίαν, καὶ μὴ περισσοτέρας. κρεῖττον πεσόντα ἀπὸ δρόμου φανερῶς ἑαυτῷ λαβεῖν γυναῖκα κατὰ νόμον, καὶ ἀτὸ παρθενίας πολλῷ χρόνῳ μετανοήσαντα εἰσαχθῆναι πάλιν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ὡς κακῶς ἐργασάμενον, ὡς παραπεσόντα, καὶ κλασθέντα, καὶ χρείαν ἔχοντα ἐπιδίματος, καὶ μὴ καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν βέλεσι κρυφίοις κατατιτρώσκεσθαι. *Hieronym.* Ep. 97 (*al.* 8) *ad Demetriadem:* Sanctum virginum propositum et cœlestis angelorumque familiæ gloriam quarundam non bene se agentium nomen infamat. Quibus aperte dicendum est, ut aut nubant, si se non possunt continere, aut contineant, si nolunt nubere. — (see § 71, note 7). *Augustinus de bono viduit.* c. 10: Qui dicunt talium nuptias non esse nuptias, sed potius adulteria, non mihi videntur satis acute ac diligenter considerare quid dicant. — Fit autem per hanc minus consideratam opinionem, qua putant lapsarum a sancto proposito feminarum, si nupserint, non esse conjugia, non parvum malum, ut a maritis separentur uxores, quasi adulteræ sint, non uxores: et quum volunt eas separatas reddere continentiæ, faciunt maritos earum adulteros veros, quum suis uxoribus vivis alteras duxerint. *Concil. Chalced. can.* 16. Παρθένον ἑαυτὴν ἀναθεῖσαν τῷ δεσπότῃ θεῷ, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ μονάζοντα, μὴ ἐξεῖναι γάμῳ προσομιλεῖν· εἰ δέ γε εὑρεθεῖεν τοῦτο ποιοῦντες, ἐστωσαν ἀκοινώνητοι· ὡρίσαμεν δὲ ἔχειν τὴν αὐθεντίαν τῆς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς φιλανθρωπίας τὸν κατὰ τόπον ἐπίσκοπον.

was long held in contempt and dislike especially in Rome.[1] The first convents were established on the small islands of Lerina (now St. Honoré), Leron (St. Marguerite), and the Stoechades (islands of Hières. Tr.), on the south coast of Gaul; Gallinaria, Gorgon, Capraria, Palmaria, on the west coast of Italy,[2] and in the islands on the Dalmatian coast:[3] whilst many of those who were desirous of

---

[1] *Hieron. Ep.* 96 (al. 16) *ad Principiam de laudibus Marcellæ:* Nulla eo tempore nobilium feminarum voverat Romæ propositum Monachorum, nec audebat propter rei novitatem ignominiosum, ut tunc putabatur, et vile in populis nomen assumere. Hæc (Marcella) ab Alexandrinis sacerdotibus, Papaque Athanasio et postea Petro, qui persecutionem Arianæ hæresecos declinantes, quasi ad tutissimum communionis suæ portum Romam confugerant, vitam beati Antonii adhuc tunc viventis, monasteriorumque in Thebaide Pachumii et virginum ac viduarum didicit disciplinam. At the burial of Blesilla, a young nun, supposed to have been killed by fasting, A. D. 384, the populace cried *(Hieronymi Ep.* 22 *al* 25 *ad Paulam):* Quousque genus detestabile monachorum non urbe pellitur? non lapidibus obruitur? non præcipitatur in fluctus? But as early as A. D. 398, *Hier. Ep.* 54 (al. 26) *ad Pammachium:* Nostris temporibus Roma possidet, quod mundus ante nescivit. Tunc rari sapientes, potentes, nobiles, Christiani: nunc multi Monachi sapientes, potentes, nobiles. Quibus cunctis Pammachius meus sapientior, potentior, nobilior: magnus in magnis, primus in primis, ἀρχιστρατηγὸς Monachorum. *Salviani Massiliensis* (about A. D. 450) *de gubernat. Dei VIII.* 4: Ita igitur et in monachis — Afrorum probatur odium, quia inridebant scilicet, quia maledicebant, quia insectabantur, quia detestabantur, quia omnia in illos pene fecerunt, quæ in salvatorem nostrum Judæorum impietas. — Intra Africæ civitates, et maxime intra Carthaginis muros, palliatum et pallidum et recisis comarum fluentium jubis usque ad cutem tonsum videre tam infelix ille populus quam infidelis sine convitio atque execratione vix poterat. Et si quando aliquis Dei servus, aut de Ægyptiorum cœnobiis, aut de sacris Hierusalem locis, aut de sanctis eremi venerandisque secretis ad urbem illam officio divini operis accessit, simul ut populo apparuit, contumelias, sacrilegia et maledictiones excepit. Nec solum hoc, sed improbissimis flagitiosorum hominum cachinnis et detestantibus ridentium sibilis quasi taureis cædebatur.

[2] *Ambrosii Hexaëmeron* III. c. 5: Quid enumerem insulas, quas velut monilia plerumque prætexit, in quibus ii, qui se abdicant intemperantiæ sæcularis illecebris, fido continentiæ proposito, eligunt mundum latere, et vitæ hujus declinare dubios anfractus? *Hieronymus, Ep.* 84 *(al.* 30*) de morte Fabiolæ*, about 400: Angusta misericordiæ ejus Roma fuit. Peragrabat ergo insulas et totum Etruscum mare, Volscorumque provinciam et reconditos curvorum littorum sinus, in quibus monachorum consistunt chori, vel proprio corpore, vel transmissa per viros sanctos ac fideles munificentia circumibat. Comp. *Rutilii Numatiani itinerarium* (A. D. 417) I. 439 seq.

> Processu pelagi jam se Capraria tollit,
> Squallet lucifugis insula plena viris.
> Ipsi se monachos Grajo cognomine dicunt, etc.

And of Gorgon he says, ibid. v. 515 seq.

> Aversor scopulos, damni monumenta recentis:
> Perditus hic vivo funere civis erat.
> Noster enim nuper, juvenis majoribus amplis,
> Nec censu inferior, conjugiove minor,
> Impulsus furiis, homines divosque reliquit,
> Et turpem latebram credulus exsul amat.
> Infelix putat illuvie cœlestia pasci;
> Seque premit læsis sævior ipse Deis.
> *Num, rogo, deterior Circæis secta venenis?*
> *Tunc mutabantur corpora, nunc animi.*

[3] *Hieronymi Ep.* 92 *(al.* 34*) ad Julianum:* Exstruis monasteria, et multus a te per insulas Dalmatiæ Sanctorum numerus sustentatur.

becoming monks went to Egypt. *Martin*, bishop of Tours from A. D. 375 – 404, founded a large cloister near that city, and was very successful in his efforts to introduce monachism into Gaul.[4] He was followed in this by John Cassian, who founded two cloisters in Massilia († some time after the year 432). In Italy the great promoter of monachism was Ambrose, and Augustine in Africa.

The discipline of the Western monks was by no means so severe as in the East; partly in consequence of the greater severity of the climate, and partly out of regard to the popular feeling.[5] Another important point of difference was that they soon abandoned mechanical labor.[6] In the West as in the East also there were different kinds of monks. Besides those who lived in convents there were monks and nuns who led a wandering life;[7] others lived an ascetic life in the cities, sometimes at a considerable expense;[8] and others imitated the extravagancies of the Oriental fanatics, though often only in appearance.[9]

§ 95.

RELATIONS OF THE MONKS TO THE CLERGY.

The monks were still reckoned amongst the laity, the convents forming separate churches, of which the abbot was usually presbyter,[1]

---

[4] *Severi Sulpicii* b. Martini vita. Epistolæ III. de Martino. Dialogi III. de virtutibus monach. Orientalium et b. Martini.

[5] *Sever. Sulp.* dial. I. 8. Edacitas in Græcis gula est, in Gallis natura. *Cassian. de institut. cœnob.* I. 11: Nam neque caligis nos, neque colobiis, seu una tunica esse contentos hiemis permittit asperitas: et parvissimi cuculli velamen, vel melotes gestatio derisum potius, quam ædificationem ullam videntibus comparabit.

[6] *Sev. Sulp.* vita Mart. c. 10, speaking of the convent near Turonum: Ars ibi exceptis scriptoribus nulla habebatur: cui tamen operi minor ætas deputabatur: majores orationi vacabant. Still, *Augustinus de opere monachorum* (cf. Retractt. II. c. 21), and *Cassianus de instit. cœnob.* lib. X. recommended that the custom of manual labor should be revived.

[7] *Augustin. de opere monach.* c. 28: Callidissimus hostis tum multos hypocritas sub habitu monachorum usquequaque dispersit, circumeuntes provincias, nusquam missos, nusquam fixos, nusquam stantes, nusquam sedentes. Alii membra martyrum, si tamen martyrum, venditant, alii fimbrias et phylacteria sua magnificant, etc.

[8] *Hieron. Ep.* 95 *(al.* 4*) ad Rusticum:* Vidi ego quosdam, qui postquam renunciavere sæculo vestimentis duntaxat et vocis professione, non rebus, nihil de pristina conversatione mutarunt. Res familiaris magis aucta quam imminuta. Eadem ministeria servulorum, idem apparatus convivii. In vitro et patella fictili aurum comeditur, et inter turbas et examina ministrorum nomen sibi vindicant solitarii.

[9] *Hier. Ep.* 18 *(al.* 22*) ad Eustochium:* Viros quoque fuge, quos videris catenatos, quibus fœminei contra Apostolum crines, hircorum barba, nigrum pallium, et nudi patientia frigoris pedes. Hæc omnia argumenta sunt diaboli. Talem olim Antonium, talem nuper Sophronium Roma congemuit. Qui postquam nobilium introierunt domos, et deceperunt mulierculas oneratas peccatis, semper discentes, et nunquam ad scientiam veritatis pervenientes, tristitiam simulant, et quasi longa jejunia furtivis noctium cibis protrahunt.

[1] *Alteserra* Ascetic. II. 2; III. 8; VII. 2.

and standing in the same relation to the bishops as other churches. As monachism was considered the perfection of Christianity, it is not strange that its professors should often have been chosen to clerical offices. This was at first resisted by the stricter monks,[2] but the resistance did not last long, and at the end of the 4th century monastic life was commonly considered as the preparation for the clergy, and especially for the office of bishop.[3]

This led naturally to the introduction of a, partially at least, monastic discipline amongst the clergy; especially in the West. The celibacy of the clergy, which had been rejected at the council of Nice, through the influence of the venerable Paphnutius,[4] was now prescribed by law, first by Siricius, bishop of Rome (A. D. 385);[5]

---

[2] *Cassian.* de instit. cœnob. XI. 17: Quapropter hæc est antiquitus patrum permanens nunc usque sententia, quam proferre sine mea confusione non potero, qui nec germanam vitare potui, nec episcopi evadere manus, *omnimodo monachum fugere debere mulieres et episcopos.* Neuter enim sinit eum, quem semel suæ familiaritati devinxerit, vel quieti cellulæ ulterius operam dare, vel divinæ theoriæ per sanctarum rerum intuitum purissimis oculis inhærere. Hence monks were not seldom ordained against their will. *Epiphan.* ep. ad Joh. Hierosol. *Theodoret.* hist. relig. c. 13. cf. *Bingham*, lib. IV. c. 7 (vol. II. p. 189 seq.).

[3] *Hieron. Ep.* 95, *ad Rusticum:* Ita age et vive in monasterio, ut clericus esse merearis. The law of Arcadius, A. D. 398 (Cod. Theod. XVI. 2, 32): Si quos forte Episcopi deesse sibi Clericos arbitrantur, ex Monachorum numero rectius ordinabunt.

[4] *Socrates* I. 11: Ἐδόκει τοῖς ἐπισκόποις νόμον νεαρὸν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν εἰσφέρειν, ὥστε τοὺς ἱερωμένους, λέγω δὲ ἐπισκόπους καὶ πρεσβυτέρους, μὴ συγκαθεύδειν ταῖς γαμεταῖς, ἃς ἔτι λαϊκοὶ ὄντες ἠγάγοντο. Καὶ ἐπεὶ περὶ τούτου βουλεύεσθαι σφοῦκειτο, διανασταὰς ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ συλλόγου τῶν ἐπισκόπων ὁ Παφνούτιος, ἐβόα μακρὰ, μὴ βαρεῖν ζυγὸν ἐπιθεῖναι τοῖς ἱερωμένοις ἀνδράσι, τίμιον εἶναι καὶ τὴν κοίτην καὶ αὐτὸν ἀμίαντον τὸν γάμον λέγων, μὴ τῇ ὑπερβολῇ τῆς ἀκριβείας μᾶλλον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν προσβλάψωσιν· οὐ γὰρ πάντας δύνασθαι φέρειν τῆς ἀπαθείας τὴν ἄσκησιν, οὐδὲ ἴσως φυλαχθήσεσθαι τὴν σωφροσύνην τῆς ἑκάστου γαμετῆς (σωφροσύνην δὲ ἐκάλει καὶ τῆς νομίμου γυναικὸς τὴν συνέλευσιν)· ἀρκεῖσθαι τὲ τὸν φθάσαντα κλήρου τυχεῖν, μηκέτι ἐπὶ γάμον ἔρχεσθαι, κατὰ τὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀρχαίαν παράδοσιν· μήτε μὴν ἀποζεύγνυσθαι ταύτης, ἣν ἅπαξ ἤδη πρότερον λαϊκὸς ὢν ἠγάγετο. Καὶ ταῦτ' ἔλεγεν ἄπειρος ὢν γάμου, καὶ ἁπλῶς εἰπεῖν γυνεικός. Ἐκ παιδὸς γὰρ ἐν ἀσκητηρίῳ ἀνετέθραπτο, καὶ ἐπὶ σωφροσύνῃ, εἰ καὶ τις ἄλλος, περιβόητος ὤν. Πείθεται πᾶς ὁ τῶν ἱερωμένων σύλλογος τοῖς Παφνουτίου λόγοις· διὸ καὶ τὴν περὶ τούτου ζήτησιν ἀπεσίγησαν, τῇ γνώμῃ τῶν βουλομένων ἀπέχεσθαι τῆς ὁμιλίας τῶν γαμετῶν καταλείψαντες. So also *Sozom.* I. 23. *Gelasii* hist. Conc. Nic. II. 32, and *Historia tripartita* II. 14. — The truth of this is doubted by Baronius, Bellarminus, Joh. Stilting (Act. Sanct. Sept. T. III. 1750. p. 784 seq.). On the other side, *Natalis Alexander* hist. eccl. sæc. IV. diss. 19. *Calixtus* de conj. cler. ed. Henke, p. 213 seq.

[5] Epistola ad Himerium Episc. Tarraconensem, c. 7: Ii vero, qui illiciti privilegii excusatione nituntur, ut sibi asserant veteri hoc lege concessum: noverint se ab omni ecclesiastico honore, quo indigne usi sunt, apostolicæ sedis auctoritate dejectos. — Quilibet episcopus, presbyter atque diaconus, quod non optamus, deinceps fuerit talis inventus, jam nunc sibi omnem per nos indulgentiæ aditum intelligat obseratum: quia ferro necesse est excidantur vulnera, quæ fomentorum non senserint medicinam. — c. 9: Quicumque itaque se ecclesiæ vovit obsequiis a sua infantia, ante pubertatis annos baptizari, et lectorum debet ministerio sociari. Qui ab accessu adolescentiæ usque ad tricesimum ætatis annum, si probabiliter vixerit, una tantum, et ea, quam virginem communi per sacerdotem benedictione perceperit, uxore contentus, acolythus et subdiaconus esse debebit; postque ad diaconii gradum, si se ipse primitus continentia præeunte dignum probarit, accedat. Unde si ultra quinque annos laudabiliter ministrarit, congrue presbyterium consequatur.

and not long after by several of the Western synods. Eusebius, bishop of Vercellæ († 371), and Augustine, went still farther, and with their clergy adopted a strictly monastic life;[6] though at first they found no imitators. We may see, indeed, from the frequent repetition of the law concerning celibacy, and the mildness with which it was found necessary to treat those who transgressed it,[7] how difficult it must have been to introduce even this among the clergy, although Jerome, Ambrose, and Augustine exhausted their eloquence in advocating it. Still Leo the Great extended this requisition even to the subdeacons.[8]

In the East this law of celibacy was rejected. It was the custom indeed in several provinces to select the unmarried for bishops, and in some of these this was extended even to the inferior clergy;[9] but for

---

Exinde, post decennium, episcopalem cathedram poterit adipisci, si tamen per hæc tempora integritas vitæ ac fidei ejus fuerit approbata. — c. 13: Monachos quoque, quos tamen morum gravitas et vitæ ac fidei institutio sancta commendat, clericorum officiis aggregari et optamus et volumus. In the middle ages it was allowed that this lex ecclesiastica was unknown in the primitive church, see *Calixtus*, l. c. p. 3 seq. 304: many, however, understood this to be the meaning of Conc. Nicæni can. 3 (according to the translation of Dionysius exiguus; Interdixit per omnia magna synodus, non episcopo, non presbytero, non diacono, nec alicui omnino qui in clero est, licere *subintroductam* habere mulierem, nisi forte aut matrem, aut sororem, aut amitam, vel eas tantum personas, quæ suspicionem effugiunt) cf. *Ælfrici* Canones, A. D. 970 (*Wilkins* Concil. Magn. Brit. I. p. 250). c. 5: At the Synod of Nice statuerunt omnes unanimi consensu, quod neque episcopus, neque presbyter, neque diaconus, nec ullus verus canonicus habeat in domo sua *uxorem* aliquam, nisi matrem, etc. Benedictus VIII. in Conc. Ticinensi between 1014 and 1024 (Mansi XIX. p. 344): Nicæni patres non solum connubium, sed etiam cum mulieribus habitationem clericis omnibus interdicunt. So also *Alfonsus a Castro* († 1550) tit. Sacerdotium: Consuetudo, juxta quam matrimonio alligatus promovebatur ad sacerdotium, invaluit usque ad tempora Niceni concilii, in quo, ut fertur, generali decreto statutum est, ne aliquis uxorem habens consecretur sacerdos. Quod statutum quum ab aliquibus minime ut decebat observaretur, Siricius Papa de hac re illos acerbissime reprehendit. The Jesuits in the 16th century were the first to claim an apostolic origin for the celibacy of the priests. *Calixtus*, l. c. p. 10 seq., 28 seq. J. G. F. Koerner vom Cœlibat du Geistlichen. Leip. 1784. 8vo. Theiner die Einfuehrung der erzwungener Ehelosigkeit, etc. Altenburg. 1826. 2 vols. 8vo.

[6] *Augustini* sermo 49 de diversis (monasterium clericorum). Concerning Eusebius, see *Ambros.* Ep. 63. (al. 82) ad Vercellenses, § 66: Hæc enim primus in Occidentis partibus diversa inter se Eusebius sanctæ memoriæ conjunxit, ut et in civitate positus instituta Monachorum teneret, et Ecclesiam regeret jejunii sobrietate.

[7] *Siricii* ep. ad Episc. Afr. (A. D. 386) c. 3. Conc. Carthag. (390) can. 2. *Innocent.* 1. ep. ad Victricium (404) cap. 9. Conc. Taurin. (397) can. 8. Carthag. V. (398) can. 3. Toletan. I. (400) can. 1, etc. Conc. Turonense I. (461) can. 2: Licet a patribus nostris emissa auctoritate id fuerit constitutum, ut, quicunque sacerdos vel levita filiorum procreationi operam dare fuisset convictus, a communione dominica abstineretur: nos tamen huic districtioni moderationem adhibentes, et justam constitutionem mollientes, id decrevimus, ut sacerdos vel levita conjugali concupiscentiæ inhærens, vel a filiorum procreatione non desinens ad altiorem gradum non ascendat, neque sacrificium Deo offerre vel plebi ministrare præsumat.

[8] *Leo* ep. 14 ad Anastas. Episc. Thessalon. (A. D. 446) c. 4. Still this was by no means common, till the times of Gregory the Great, see *Calixtus*, l. c. 280 seq.

[9] In those countries where Monachism was most prevalent. *Hieronym.* adv. Vigilantium: Quid facient Orientis ecclesiæ? quid Ægypti et sedis Apostolicæ?

the most part they were allowed to live in wedlock,[10] and Chrysostom expressly combats the notion that the clergy were peculiarly bound to live unmarried.[11]

CHAPTER FIFTH.

HISTORY OF THE CHANGES IN PUBLIC WORSHIP.

§ 96.

The church having now triumphed over its enemies, and become rich and powerful, the effect of these circumstances was seen in the increasing splendor of its ceremonial. Many of the new converts, too, had brought with them the pagan propensity to external magnificence in religion, either simply as a gratification of taste, or as the offering of superstition. Even those who were capable of higher views yielded to this propensity, either that the pagans might be more readily won over to Christianity, or from regard to what they might deem mistaken piety.[1] But in proportion as the vital principle

---

quæ aut virgines clericos accipiunt, aut continentes, aut si uxores habuerint, mariti esse desistunt. *Epiphan. hær.* 59, § 4. *Expos. fidei cath.* § 21. Synesius, when chosen bishop of Ptolemais wrote to his brother Eutropius (Ep. 101): *ὅ τε θεὸς, ὅ τε νόμος, ἥ τε ἱερὰ Θεοφίλου χεὶρ γυναῖκα ἐπιδέδωκε· προαγορεύω τοίνυν ἅπασι καὶ μαρτύρομαι, ὡς ἐγὼ ταύτης οὔτε ἀλλοτριώσομαι καθάπαξ, οὔτε ὡς μοιχὸς αὐτῇ λάθρα συνέσομαι· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἥκιστα εὐσεβὲς, τὸ δὲ ἥκιστα νόμιμον· ἀλλὰ βουλήσομαί τε καὶ εὔξομαι, συχνά μοι πάνυ καὶ χρηστὰ γενέσθαι παιδία.* Nevertheless he became bishop, *Evagrius* l. 15.

[10] Comp. *Conc. Gangrense*, § 93, note 26. Examples of married bishops in the 4th century in *Calixtus*, p. 258. The father of Gregory Nazianzen was a priest; for he makes him say, *Carmen de vita sua*, v. 512:

> Οὔπω τοσοῦτον ἐκμεμέτρηκας βίον,
> Ὅσος διῆλθε θυσιῶν ἐμοὶ χρόνος.

(Evasions of *Papebrochias*, Act. SS. Maji T. II. p. 370; against *Tillemont*, who explained honestly the Jesuit *Mémoires de Trevoux* 1707 Avril p. 711, cf. Calixtus l. c. p. 261 seq. Ullmanns Gregor v. Naz. S. 551 ff.) *Socrates* V. 22: *Ἔγνων δὲ ἐγὼ καὶ ἕτερον ἔθος ἐν Θεσσαλίᾳ. Γενόμενος κληρικὸς ἐκεῖ, ἦν νόμῳ γαμήσας πρὶν κληρικὸς γένηται, μετὰ τὸ κληρικὸς γενέσθαι συγκαθεύδήσας αὐτῇ, ἀποκήρυκτος γίνεται· τῶν ἐν ἀναπολῇ πάντων γνώμῃ ἀπεχομένων, καὶ τῶν ἐπισκόπων, εἰ καὶ βούλοιντο, οὐ μὴν ἀνάγκῃ νόμου τοῦτο ποιούντων. Πολλοὶ γὰρ αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς καὶ παῖδας ἐκ τῆς νομίμης γαμετῆς πεποιήκασιν.*

[11] *Chrysost. in epist.* I. *ad Corinth.* Hom. XIX. ad 1 Cor. vii. 1: *Καὶ τινες μέν φασιν, ὅτι πρὸς ἱερέας ὁ λόγος οὗτος αὐτῷ εἴρηται· ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἑξῆς σκοπῶν, οὐκ ἂν φαίην τοῦτο οὕτως ἔχειν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν καθολικῶς ἔθηκε τὴν παραίνεσιν· εἰ δὲ ἱερεῦσι μόνον ταῦτα ἔγραφεν, εἶπεν ἄν· "καλὸν τῷ διδασκάλῳ γυναικὸς μὴ ἅπτεσθαι·" νυνὶ δὲ καθόλου αὐτὸ τίθεικε "καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ" λέγων, "οὐχ ἱερεῖ μόνον." Καὶ πάλιν "λέλυσαι ἀπὸ γυναικός; μὴ ζήτει γυναῖκα·" οὐκ εἶπε "σὺ ὁ ἱερεὺς καὶ διδάσκαλος," ἀλλ' ἀδιορίστως· καὶ ὅλος διόλου τοιοῦτος πρόεισιν ὁ λόγος.*

[1] This irruption of heathen usages into the church is acknowledged as early as *Baptista Mantuanus* in *Fastis* mense Febr. et Novembre, *Beatas Rhenanus* ad

of piety died away, the greater stress was laid on external forms, and an endless variety of customs, which at first had only been tolerated, thus grew into laws.[2]

§ 97.

NEW OBJECTS OF WORSHIP.

Jo. Dallæus adversus Latinorum de cultus religiosi objecto traditionem. Genevæ. 1664. 4to.

The more remote the times of the martyrs, the greater the adoration paid to them.[1] The heathen converts, naturally enough, transferred to them the honors they had been used to pay their demi-gods,[2] whilst the horror of creature-worship, which had hitherto operated as a check on the growing superstition, had been gradually dying away since the extinction of paganism.[3] As men had long been accustomed to assemble for public worship at the graves of the martyrs, the idea of erecting churches (Μαρτύριον, Memoria)[4] over them would readily occur. In Egypt the Christians began to embalm

---

Tertull. contra Marc. lib. V., and de corona militis, *Polydorus Virgilius* de rerum inventoribus lib. V. c. 1. *Baronius* ann. 58, § 76. ann. 200, § 5. Shown more at length by *(Mussard)*: les conformitez des ceremonies modernes avec les anciennez. (Londres) 1667. 8vo. (new ed. Amsterd. 1744); *Conyers Middleton:* A letter from Rome, showing an exact conformity between Popery and Paganism; *Jo. Marangonius:* delle Cose gentilesche e profane transportate ad uso e ad ornamento delle Chiese. Rom. 1744. 4to. (compare the continuation of the same, 1752. S. 511 ff.); *Ge. Christ. Hamberger:* Enarratio rituum, quos Romana ecclesia a majoribus suis gentilibus in sua sacra transtulit Gotting. 1751. (reprinted in *J. P. Berg* Museum Duisburgense, T. I. P. II. p. 363 seq.); *John James Blunt:* Vestiges of ancient manners and customs, discoverable in modern Italy and Sicily. London, 1823.

[2] *Leo M. Sermo* 77. *de jejun. Pentecost.* 2. Dubitandum non est, quicquid ab Ecclesia in consuetudinem devotionis est receptum, de traditione apostolica, et de Sancti Spiritus prodire doctrina.

[1] Compare *Sagittarius de natalitiis martyrum,* cap. 5, § 19 seq. Bossuets Gesch. d. Welt u. d. Religion, continued by J. A. Cramer.

[2] To which even the Apologists of the day contributed. *Euseb. Præp. Evang.* XIII. c. 11, cites a passage of Plato concerning the worship of Demons, and continues: Καὶ ταῦτα δὴ ἁρμόζει ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν θεοφιλῶν τελευτῇ, οὓς στρατιώτας τῆς ἀληθοῦς εὐσεβείας οὐκ ἂν ἁμάρτοις εἰπών, παραλαμβάνεσθαι. Ὅθεν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς θήκας αὐτῶν ἔθος ἡμῖν παρίναι, καὶ τὰς εὐχὰς παρὰ ταύταις ποιεῖσθαι, τιμῶν τε τὰς μακαρίας αὐτῶν ψυχὰς, ὡς εὐλόγως καὶ τούτων ὑφ' ἡμῶν γιγνομένων. See note 19, below.

[3] Compare the honors paid to the emperors: their edicts were termed *divina, sacra, cælestia:* their statues were approached with adoration and incense *(Zorn* in Miscell. Groning. vol. I. p. 186 seq. Meanders Chrysostomus. Bd. 2. S. 322). Law of *Theodosius* II. A. D. 425 (Cod. Theod. XV. 4, 1): Si quando nostræ statuæ vel imagines eriguntur, — adsit judex sine adorationis ambitioso fastigio. — excedens cultura hominum dignitatem superno numini reservetur. cf. *de Rhoer* dissertt. de effectu relig. Christ. in jurisprud. Rom. p. 41 seq.

[4] So called at first, *Eusebius* de vita Const. III. 48. Afterwards called also Ἀποστολεῖον. Προφητεῖον.

the bodies of reputed saints, and keep them in their houses.[5] The communion with the martyrs being thus associated with the presence of their material remains, these were dug up from the graves and placed in the churches,[6] especially under the altars;[7] and the popular feeling having now a visible object to excite it, became more extravagant and superstitious than ever. The old opinion of the efficacy of their intercession, who had died a martyr's death,[8] was now united with the belief that it was possible to communicate with them directly: a belief founded partly on the popular notion that departed souls always lingered around the bodies they had once inhabited,[9] and partly on the views entertained of the

---

[5] A practice strongly disapproved by St. Anthony, comp. *Athanasius* in vita Antonii (Opp. T. II. p. 502): τῶν δὲ ἀδελφῶν βιαζομένων μεῖναι αὐτὸν παρ' αὐτοῖς, κἀκεῖ τελευθῆναι, οὐκ ἠνέχετο, — διὰ τοῦτο δὲ μάλιστα· οἱ Λιγύπτιοι τὰ τῶν τελευτώντων σπουδαίων σώματα, καὶ μάλιστα τῶν ἁγίων μαρτύρων φιλοῦσι μὲν θάπτειν καὶ στρειλίσσειν ὀθονίοις, μὴ κρύπτειν δὲ ὑπὸ γῆν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ σκιμποδίων τιθέναι, καὶ φυλάττειν ἔνδον παρ' ἑαυτοῖς, νομίζοντες ἐν τούτῳ τιμᾶν τοὺς ἀπελθόντας. Ὁ δὲ Ἀντώνιος πολλάκις περὶ τούτου καὶ ἐπισκόπους ἠξίου παραγγέλλειν τοῖς λαοῖς· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ λαϊκοὺς ἐνέτρεπεν, καὶ γυναιξὶν ἐπέκλπτεν, λέγων, μήτε νόμιμον, μήτε ὅλως ὅσιον εἶναι τοῦτο. Καὶ γὰρ τὰ τῶν Πατριαρχῶν καὶ τῶν Προφητῶν σώματα μέχρι νῦν σάζεται εἰς μνήματα, καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ τοῦ κυρίου σῶμα εἰς μνημεῖον ἐτέθη. — Καὶ ταῦτα λέγων ἐδείκνυε, παρανομεῖν τὸν μετὰ θάνατον μὴ κρύπτοντα τὰ σώματα τῶν τελευτώντων, κἄν ἅγια τυγχάνῃ· τί γὰρ μεῖζον ἢ ἁγιώτερον τοῦ κυριακοῦ σώματος; — Αὐτὸς δὲ τοῦτο γινώσκων, καὶ φοβούμενος, μὴ καὶ τὸ αὐτοῦ ποιήσωσιν οὕτως σῶμα, ἤπειξεν ἑαυτὸν, συνταξάμενος τοῖς ἐν τῷ ἔξω ὄρει μοναχοῖς.

[6] The first instance of the transferring of the bodies of the saints to the churches recounted by *Hieron.* contra Vigilant, who relates that the bodies of St. Andrew, St. Luke, and St. Timothy, were so disposed of by command of Constantius, A. D. 359.

[7] *Ambrosii* Ep. 22 (al. 85. al. 54.) *ad Marcellinam sororem*, § 13: Succedant victimæ triumphales in locum, ubi Christi hostia est. Sed ille super altare, qui pro omnibus passus est: isti sub altari, qui illius redempti sunt passione. Hunc ego locum prædestinaveram mihi: dignum est enim ut ibi requiescat sacerdos, ubi offerre consuevit: sed cedo sacris victimis dexteram portionem, locus iste martyribus debebatur. *Hieronymus adv. Vigilant.* Male facit ergo Romanus Episcopus, qui super mortuorum hominum Petri et Pauli, secundum nos ossa veneranda, secundum te vilem pulvisculum, offert Domino sacrificia, et tumulos eorum Christi arbitratur altaria? *Sozomenus* V. 9 and 19. cf. *Goth. Voigti Thysiasterilogia s. de altaribus vett. Christt.* Hamb. 1709. 8vo. p. 250 seq. The passage, *Apoc.* vi. 9, was not yet used, however, in justification of this practice, see *Dallæus adv. Latinorum de cultus relig. objecto traditionem*, Lib. IV. c. 9.

[8] See § 72, note 6.

[9] This was a notion of the heathen. cf. *Platonis* Phædon. Tibullus I. 6, 15. *Macrobius* de Somn. Scip. I. 9 and 13. *Porphyrius* de abstin. II. 47. *Lactantius* II. 2: vulgus existimat, mortuorum animas circa tumulos et corporum suorum reliquias oberrare. cf. *Wetstenii* Nov. Test. I. p. 354. Hence Conc. Illiberitanum, c. 34. Cereos per diem placuit in cœmeterio non incendi: inquietandi enim spiritus Sanctorum non sunt. With the views of the more spiritual Origenists this did not of course agree. cf. *Macarii Politici* (about A. D. 370) sermo de excessu justorum et peccatorum in *Cave* hist. liter. vol. I. p. 259, and in *J. Tollii* insignia itineris Italici (Traj. ad Rhen. 1696. 4to.), p. 196. Compare, however, *Ambrosii* de viduis, c. 9: martyres obsecrandi, quorum videmur nobis quodam corporis pignore patrocinium vindicare. — isti enim sunt Dei martyres, nostri præsules, speculatores vitæ, actuumque nostrorum. — *Pseudo-Ambrosii* (perhaps *Maximi Taurinensis*, about 430) Sermo VI. de Sanctis: Cuncti martyres devotissime percolendi sunt, sed specialiter ii venerandi sunt a nobis, quorum reliquias possidemus. Illi enim

glorified state of the martyrs, a sort of omnipresence being ascribed to them.[10] These notions may be traced to Origen, and his followers were the first who apostrophized the martyrs in their sermons, and besought their intercession.[11] But though the orators were some-

---

nos orationibus adiuvant, isti etiam adiuvant passione. Cum his autem nobis familiaritas est. Semper enim nobiscum sunt, nobiscum morantur, hoc est, et in corpore nos viventes custodiunt, et de corpore recedentes excipiunt. Hic ne peccatorum labes absumat, ibi ne inferni horror invadat.

[10] As the heathen to their demons (*Hesiodi Opera et Dies* v. 121 seq.). cf. *Hieronymus ad Vigilantium:* Tu Deo leges pones? Tu Apostolis vincula injicies, ut usque ad diem judicii teneantur custodia, nec sint cum domino suo, de quibus scriptum est: *Sequuntur agnum, quocunque vadit* (*Apoc.* xiv. 4)? Si agnus ubique, ergo et hi, qui cum agno sunt, ubique esse credendi sunt. *Gregorii Naz. Orat.* XVIII. *in laudem Cypriani*, p. 286: σὺ δὲ ἡμᾶς ἐποπτεύοις ἄνωθεν ἵλεως, καὶ τὸν ἡμέτερον διεξάγοις λόγον καὶ βίον, καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦτο ποίμνιον τοιμαίνοις, ἢ συμποιμαίνοις κ. τ. λ. *Sulpicius Severus*, Ep. II. de obitu b. Martini (ed. Lips. 1709. p. 371): non deerit nobis ille, mihi crede, non deerit: intererit de se sermocinantibus, adstabit orantibus: quodque jam hodie præstare dignatus est, videndum se in gloria sua sæpe præbebit, et adsidua, sicut ante paullulum fecit, benedictione nos proteget. Afterwards these notions began to be considered at the least doubtful; but prayer to the martyrs had already become so well established that it was nevertheless continued. cf. *Augustinus de cura gerenda pro mortuis*, c. 13: Si rebus viventium interessent animæ mortuorum, et ipsæ nos quando eas videmus alloquerentur in somnis; ut de aliis taceam, me ipsum pia mater nulla nocte desereret, quæ terra marique secuta est, ut mecum viveret. — Isaias propheta dicit (lxiii. 16): *Tu es enim pater noster: quia Abraham nescivit nos, et Israel non cognovit nos.* Si tanti Patriarchæ quid erga populum ex his procreatum ageretur ignoraverunt, — quomodo mortui vivorum rebus atque actibus cognoscendis adiuvandisque miscentur? In the case of the martyrs, indeed, he seems disposed to allow a miraculous exception (c. 16), but proceeds: Quamquam ista quæstio vires intelligentiæ meæ vincit, quemadmodum opitulentur Martyres iis, quos per eos certum est juvari; utrum ipsi per se ipsos adsint uno tempore tam diversis locis, — sive ubi sunt eorum Memoriæ, sive præter suas Memorias ubicumque adesse sentiuntur: an ipsis in loco suis meritis congruo ab omni mortalium conversatione remotis, et tamen generaliter orantibus pro indigentiis supplicantium — Deus — exaudiens Martyrum preces, per angelica ministeria usquequaque diffusa præbeat hominibus ista solatia, quibus in hujus vitæ miseria judicat esse præbenda; et suorum merita Martyrum, ubi vult, quando vult, quomodo vult, maximeque per eorum Memorias, quoniam hoc novit expedire nobis ad ædificandum fidem Christi, — mirabili atque ineffabili potestate ac bonitate commendet. Res hæc altior est, quam ut a me possit attingi, et abstrusior, quam ut a me valeat perscrutari: et ideo quid horum duorum sit, an vero fortassis utrumque sit, ut aliquando fiant per ipsam præsentiam Martyrum, aliquando per Angelos suscipientes personam Martyrum, definire non audeo; mallem a scientibus ista perquirere. cf. *de Civit. Dei* XXII. c. 9.

[11] *Basilii M. hom.* 19, in XL. *Martyres* § 8: οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς χώραν διαλαβόντες, οἱονεὶ πύργοι τινὲς συνεχεῖς, ἀσφάλειαν ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἐναντίων καταδρομῆς παρεχόμενοι· οὐχ ἑνὶ τόπῳ ἑαυτοὺς κατακλείσαντες, ἀλλὰ πολλοῖς ἤδη ἐπιξενωθέντες χωρίοις, καὶ πολλὰς πατρίδας κατακοσμήσαντες. Καὶ τὸ παράδοξον, οὐ καθ' ἕνα διαμερισθέντες τοῖς δεχομένοις ἐπιφοιτῶσιν, ἀλλ' ἀναμιχθέντες ἀλλήλοις, ἡνωμένοις χορεύουσιν· ὦ τοῦ θαύματος! — οὔτε ἐλλείπουσι τῷ ἀριθμῷ, οὔτε πλεονασμὸν ἐπιδίχονται· ἐὰν εἰς ἑκατὸν αὐτοὺς διέλῃς, τὸν οἰκεῖον ἀριθμὸν οὐκ ἐκβαίνουσιν· ἐὰν εἰς ἓν συναγάγῃς, τεσσαράκοντα καὶ οὕτω μένουσι, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πυρὸς φύσιν· καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνο καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἐξάπτοντα μεταβαίνει, καὶ ὅλον ἐστὶ παρὰ τῷ ἔχοντι· καὶ οἱ τεσσαράκοντα, καὶ πάντες εἰσὶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ πάντες εἰσὶ παρ' ἑκάστῳ· — ὁ θλιβόμενος ἐπὶ τοὺς τεσσαράκοντα καταφεύγει, ὁ εὐφραινόμενος ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἀποτρέχει. ὁ μὲν, ἵνα λύσιν εἴρῃ τῶν δυσχερῶν· ὁ δὲ, ἵνα φυλαχθῇ αὐτῷ τὰ χρηστότερα. ἐνταῦθα γυνὴ εὐσεβὴς ὑπὲρ τέκνων εὐχομένη καταλαμβάνεται, ἀποδημοῦντι ἀνδρὶ τὴν ἐπάνοδον αἰτουμένη, ἀῤῥωστοῦντι τὴν σωτηρίαν· μετὰ

what extravagant in this respect, they were far outdone by the poets, who soon took up this theme, and could find no expressions strong enough to describe the power and the glory of the martyrs.[12] Their relics soon began to work miracles, and to be valuable articles of trade.[13]

In proportion as men felt the need of such intercession they sought to increase the number of the intercessors. Not only those, who, on account of services rendered the church, were inscribed in the Diptycha,* but the pious characters from the Old Testament, and the most distinguished of the monks,[14] were ranked amongst the saints. Martyrs before unknown announced themselves in visions; others revealed the place of their burial.[15] From the beginning of the 5th century the prayers for the saints[16] were discon-

---

μαρτύρων γενέσθω τὰ αἰτήματα ὑμῶν· —"Ω χορὸς ἅγιος! ὦ σύνταγμα ἱερόν! ὦ συνασπισμὸς ἀῤῥαγής! ὦ κοινοὶ φύλακες τοῦ γένους τῶν ἀνθρώπων! ἀγαθοὶ κοινωνοὶ φροντίδων, δηπότως συνεργοί, πρεσβευταὶ δυνατώτατοι, ἀστέρες τῆς οἰκουμένης, ἄνδη τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν! ὑμᾶς οὐχ ἡ γῆ κατέκρυψεν, ἀλλ' οὐρανὸς ὑπεδέξατο κ. τ. λ. cf. *Hom.* XXIII. *in Mamantem Martyrem. Gregorii Naz. Orat.* XVIII *in laudem Cypriani. Gregorii Nysseni Orat. in Theodorum Mart.*

[12] So especially the Spanish writer Aurelius *Prudentius* Clemens (about A. D. 405 *Poemata ed. Jo. Weitzius* Hanov. 1613. 8vo. *Nic. Heinsius.* Amst. 1667. 12mo. *Chr. Cellarius.* Halæ 1703. 8vo. in his lib. περὶ στεφανῶν, containing fourteen hymns upon the martyrs, *H. Middeldorpf comm. de Prudentio et Theologia Prudentiana* (Wratisl. Partes II. 1823. 26. 4to.) P. II p. 28 seq. and *Pontius Paulinus*, bishop of Nola, († 431. Letters and Poems *ed. J. B. le Brun.* Paris, 1685. Tomi II. 4to. in Bibl. max. PP. T. VI. p. 163 seq.) especially in the ten *natales S. Felicis.*

[13] See § 94, note 7. The law of Theodosius I. A. D. 386 (*Cod. Theod.* IX. 17, 7): Humatum corpus nemo ad alterum locum transferat; nemo martyrem distrahat, nemo mercetur. Habeant vero in potestate, si quolibet in loco sanctorum est aliquis conditus, pro eius veneratione, quod martyrium vocandum sit, addant quod voluerint fabricarum.

* Diptycha. A double catalogue, in one part whereof were written the names of the living, and in the other those of the dead, which were to be rehearsed during the office. *Rees' Cyclop.* Tr.

[14] *Joannes Cassianus Collat.* VI. c. 1: In Palæstinæ partibus juxta Tecuæ vicum — solitudo vastissima est usque ad Arabiam ac mare mortuum — In hac summæ vitæ ac sanctitatis monachi diutissime commorantes, repente sunt a discurrentibus Saracenorum latrunculis interempti. Quorum corpora — tam a Pontificibus regionis illius quam ab universa plebe Arabum tanta veneratione præcepta, et inter reliquias martyrum condita, ut innumeri populi e duobus oppidis concurrentes gravissimum sibi certamen indixerint, et usque ad gladiorum conflictum pro sancta rapina sit eorum progressa contentio, dum pia inter se devotione decertant, quinam justius eorum sepulturam ac reliquias possiderent, aliis scilicet de vicinia commorationis ipsorum, aliis de originis propinquitate gloriantibus.

[15] Thus Ambrose discovered the bodies of Protasius and Gervasius. *Ambros. Epist.* 22, *ad Sororem. August. de Civ. Dei* XXII. 8. The populace were disposed to consider every obscure grave as the grave of a martyr. *Sulpicius Severus de vita Martini* c. 11.

[16] *Epiphan. hær.* 75, § 7: καὶ γὰρ δικαίων ποιούμεθα τὴν μνήμην, καὶ ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτωλῶν· — ὑπὲρ δὲ δικαίων, καὶ πατέρων, καὶ Πατριαρχῶν, Προφητῶν καὶ Ἀποστόλων, καὶ Εὐαγγελιστῶν, καὶ Μαρτύρων, καὶ Ὁμολογητῶν, Ἐπισκόπων τε καὶ Ἀναχωρητῶν, καὶ παντὸς τοῦ τάγματος, ἵνα τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀφορίσωμεν ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων τάξεως, — ἐν ἐννοίᾳ ὄντες, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἐξεσούμενος ὁ κύριος τινὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, κἂν τε μυρία καὶ ἐπίκεινα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ὑπάρχῃ ἕκαστος ἀνθρώπων. *cf. Constit. Apostoll.*

tinued as unbefitting their glorified state.[17] Christians were now but seldom called upon to address their prayers to God;[18] the usual mode being to pray only to some saint for his intercession. With this worship of the saints were joined many of the customs of the heathen. Men chose their patron saints, and dedicated churches to their worship.[19] The heathen, whom the Christians used to reproach

---

VIII. c. 12, *Cyrill. Hieros. Catech. Mystag.* V. § 8. Such intercessions in their more ancient form may be found in the liturgia of the Nestorians, e. g. *Liturgia Theodori Interpretis* (in *Renaudotii Liturgiarum orientalium collectio* Tom. II. p. 620): Domine et Deus noster, suscipe a nobis per gratiam tuam sacrificium hoc gratiarum actionis, fructus scilicet rationabiles labiorum nostrorum, ut sit coram te memoria bona justorum antiquorum, Prophetarum sanctorum, Apostolorum beatorum, Martyrum et Confessorum, Episcoporum, Doctorum, Sacerdotum, Diaconorum, et omnium filiorum Ecclesiæ sanctæ Catholicæ, eorum qui in fide vera transierunt ex hoc mundo, ut per gratiam tuam, Domine, veniam illis concedas, omnium peccatorum et delictorum, quæ in hoc mundo, in corpore mortali, et anima mutatione obnoxia peccaverunt aut offenderunt coram te, quia nemo est qui non peccet. So too *Liturgia Nestorii* in *Renaudot.* l. c. p. 633. *cf. Bingham* Lib. XV. c. 3, § 16, 17 (vol. VI. p. 330 seq.).

[17] *Augustin.* Serm. 17: Injuria est enim pro martyre orare, cujus nos debemus orationibus commendari (cited by Innocent III. as sacræ scripturæ auctoritas. Decretal. Gregorii lib. III. tit. 41, c. 6, in order to justify the change of the old formula annue nobis, Domine, ut animæ famuli tui Leonis hæc prosit oblatio, into: annue nobis, quæsumus, Domine, ut intercessione B. Leonis hæc nobis prosit oblatio).

[18] *Ambrosiaster ad Rom.* i. 22, speaking of those who honored the elements, the stars, etc. Solent tamen pudorem passi, neglecti Dei misera uti excusatione, dicentes per istos posse iri ad Deum, sicut per comites pervenitur ad regem. Age, numquid tam demens est aliquis, aut salutis suæ immemor, ut honorificentiam regis vindicet comiti, cum de hac re si qui etiam tractare fuerint inventi, jure ut rei damnentur majestatis? Et isti se non putant reos, qui honorem nominis Dei deferunt creaturæ, et relicto Domino conservos adorant; quasi sit aliquid plus, quod reservetur Deo. Nam et ideo ad regem per tribunos aut comites itur, quia homo utique est rex, et nescit quibus debeat rempublicam credere. Ad Deum autem, quem utique nihil latet (omnium enim merita novit) promerendum suffragatore non opus est, sed mente devota. Ubicunque enim talis loquutus fuerit ei, respondebit illi. So *Chrysostomus in Matth. hom.* 52 (*al.* 53) § 3, after repeating the history of the woman of Canaan (Matth. xv. 21): σὺ δέ μοι σκόπει, τῶς τῶν ἀποστόλων ἠττηθέντων καὶ οὐκ ἀνυσάντων, αὕτη ἤνυσε· τοσουτόν ἐστι προσιδρεία εὐχῆς· καὶ γὰρ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμετέρων παρ' ἡμῶν βούλεται μᾶλλον τῶν ὑστευδύνων ἀξιοῦσθαι ἢ παρ' ἑτέρων ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.

[19] *Theodoreti græc. affect. curat. disp.* 8 (*ed. Schultze* T. IV. p. 902): αἱ μὲν γενναῖαι τῶν νικηφόρων ψυχαὶ περιστολοῦσι τὸν οὐρανόν, — τὰ δὲ σώματα, οὐχ εἷς ἑνὸς κατακρύπτει τάφος ἑκάστου· ἀλλὰ πόλεις καὶ κῶμαι ταῦτα διανειμάμεναι, σωτῆρας καὶ ψυχῶν καὶ σωμάτων, καὶ ἰατροὺς ὀνομάζουσι, καὶ ὡς πολιούχους τιμῶσι καὶ φύλακας· καὶ χρώμενοι προσβευταῖς πρὸς τὸν τῶν ὅλων δεσπότην, διὰ τούτων τὰς θείας κομίζονται δωρεάς. *pag.* 921: οἱ δέ γε τῶν καλλινίκων μαρτύρων σηκοὶ, λαμπροὶ καὶ περίβλεπτοι, καὶ μεγίθει διαπρεπεῖς, καὶ παντοδαπῶς πεποικιλμένοι, καὶ κάλλους ἀφίεντες μαρμαρυγάς. εἰς δὲ τούτους οὐχ ἅπαξ ἢ δίς γε τοῦ ἔτους ἢ πεντάκις φοιτῶμεν· ἀλλὰ πολλάκις μὲν πανηγύρεις ἐπιτελοῦμεν, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ ἡμέρας ἑκάστης τῷ τούτων Δεσπότῃ τοὺς ὕμνους προσφέρομεν· καὶ οἱ μὲν ὑγιαίνοντες αἰτοῦσι τῆς ὑγείας τὴν φυλακήν· οἱ δὲ τινὶ νόσῳ παλαίοντες, τὴν τῶν παθημάτων ἀπαλλαγήν· αἰτοῦσι δὲ καὶ ἄγονοι παῖδας, καὶ στέριφαι παρακαλοῦσι γενέσθαι μητέρες. — καὶ οἱ μὲν εἴς τινα ἀποδημίαν στελλόμενοι, λιπαροῦσι τούτους ξυνοδοιπόρους γενέσθαι, καὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ ἡγεμόνας· οἱ δὲ τῆς ἐπανόδου τετυχηκότες, τὴν τῆς χάριτος ὁμολογίαν προσφέρουσιν· οὐχ ὡς θεοῖς αὐτοῖς προσιόντες, ἀλλ' ὡς θείους ἀνθρώπους ἀντιβολοῦντες, καὶ γενέσθαι προεσβευτὰς ὑπὲρ σφῶν παρακαλοῦντες. ὅτι δὲ τυγχάνουσιν ὧνπερ αἰτοῦσιν οἱ πιστῶς ἐπαγγέλλοντες, ἀναφανδὸν μαρτυρεῖ τὰ τούτων ἀναθήματα, τὴν ἰατρείαν δηλοῦντα· οἱ μὲν γὰρ ὀφθαλμῶν, οἱ δὲ ποδῶν, ἄλλοι δὲ χειρῶν προσφέρουσιν ἐκτυπώματα· καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐκ χρυσοῦ, οἱ δὲ ἐξ ὕλης ἀργύρου πεποιημένα.

with worshipping dead men,[20] found now ample opportunity of retort.[21]

Throughout the 4th century there was no peculiar preference of the Virgin Mary above other saints. The church went as yet no farther than to maintain the doctrine of her perpetual virginity, to which the monastic notions of the time naturally led. (See § 93, note 13.) The opinion that she had ever borne other children than Jesus[22] was declared to be heresy; as for instance by Epiphanius (hær. 78), in the case of the *Ἀντιδικομαριανῖται* in Arabia (A. D. 367), by Jerome in the case of Helvidius at Rome (A. D. 383),[23] and by the Macedonian bishops in the case of Bonosus, bishop of Sardica (A. D. 391),[24] whilst it was shown in what way she gave birth to our Saviour without ceasing to be a virgin.[25] Neither did the teachers of the church in the 4th century scruple to attribute to her faults;[26] and Epiphanius includes certain women in his cata-

---

pag. 923: *τοὺς γὰρ οἰκείους νεκροὺς ὁ Δεσπότης ἀντεισήξει τοῖς ὑμετέροις θεοῖς· καὶ τοὺς μὲν φρούδους ἀπέφηνε, τούτοις δὲ τὰ ἐκείνων ἀπίνιμε γέρα· ἀντὶ γὰρ δὴ τῶν Πανδίων, καὶ Διασίων, καὶ Διονυσίων, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὑμῶν ἑορτῶν, Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου καὶ Θωμᾶ καὶ Σεργίου — καὶ τῶν ἄλλων μαρτύρων, ἐπιτελοῦνται δημοθοινίαι κ. τ. λ.* Comp. Neanders Chrysostomus, Bd. 2. S. 128 f.

[20] *Arnobius* adv. gentiles VI. 6. — multa ex his templa — comprobatur contegere cineres atque ossa, et functorum esse corporum sepulturas, etc.

[21] *Julianus* ap. Cyrill. adv. Jul. X. p. 335. *Eunapius* in vita Aedesii ed. Genev. 1616. p. 65, *Ammian. Marcell.* XII. 11.

[22] *Basilius M. hom. in sanctam Christi generationem* c. 5 (Opp. T. I. p. 598), remarks ad Matth. i. 25: *οὐκ ἐγίνωσκε αὐτὴν, ἕως οὗ ἔτεκε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον· τοῦτο δὲ ἤδη ὑστόνοιαν συρέχει, ὅτι μετὰ τὸ καθαρῶς ὑπηρετήσασθαι τῇ γεννήσει τοῦ κυρίου τῇ ἐπιτελεσθείσῃ διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, τὰ νενομισμένα τοῦ γάμου ἔργα μὴ ἀπαρνησαμένης τῆς Μαρίας· ἡμεῖς δὲ, εἰ καὶ μηδὲν τῷ τῆς εὐσεβείας παραλυμαίνεται λόγῳ, (μέχρι γὰρ τῆς κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν ὑπηρεσίας ἀναγκαία ἡ παρθενία, τὸ δ' ἐφεξῆς ἀπολυπραγμόνητον τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ μυστηρίου,) ὅμως διὰ τὸ μὴ καταδίχεσθαι τῶν φιλοχρίστων τὴν ἀκοὴν, ὅτι ποτὲ ἐπαύσατο εἶναι παρθένος ἡ θεοτόκος, ἐκείνας ἡγούμεθα τὰς μαρτυρίας αὐτάρκεις.*

[23] *Hieron. adv. Helvidium* lib. in Opp. ed. Martianay T. IV. ed. Vallarsi T. II. Concerning the Antidokemarianites and Helvidius, see Walch's Ketzergeschichte. Th. 3. S. 577 ff.

[24] *Siricii Ep.* 9, ad Anysium Thessal. aliosque Illyrici Episcopos (formerly ascribed erroneously to Ambrose, and cited as Ambrosii, Ep. 79, or 5) comp. Walch l. c. S. 598 ff.

[25] *Epiphanius hær.* LXXVIII. § 19, does not hesitate to say, in reference to Luke ii. 23; Exod. xiii. 2: *οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ἀνοίγων μήτραν μητρός.* On the other hand, *Ambrosius Ep.* 42 (*al* 81, *al.* 7) *ad Siricium P.* Hæc est virgo, quæ in utero concepit: virgo, quæ peperit filium. Sic enim scriptum est: *Ecce virgo in utero accipiet, et pariet filium* (Es. vii. 14); non enim concepturam tantummodo virginem, sed et parituram virginem dixit. Quæ autem est illa porta sanctuarii, porta illa exterior ad Orientem, quæ manet clausa; et *nemo*, inquit, *pertransibit per eam, nisi solus Deus Israel* (Ezech. xliv. 2)? Nonne hæc porta Maria est, per quam in hunc mundum redemtor intravit? — de qua scriptum est, quia *Dominus pertransibit per eam, et erit clausa* post partum; quia virgo concepit et genuit. *Hieronymus adv. Pelagianos* lib. II. (*Opp. ed. Martian.* T. IV. P. II. p. 512): Solus enim Christus clausas portas vulvæ virginalis aperuit, quæ tamen clausæ jugiter permanserunt. Hæc est porta orientalis clausa, per quam solus Pontifex ingreditur et egreditur et nihilominus semper clausa est.

[26] After the example of Irenæus III. 18. Tertull. de carne Christi 7. Origé-

logue of heretics for their extravagant adoration of the Virgin.[27] The Nestorian controversy first led men to set her above all other saints as the mother of God (θεοτόκος).

Though it was the general belief that the *angels* watched over men and brought their prayers to God, it was thought unallowable to worship them because of the passages Col. ii. 18; Revelations xix. 10; xxii. 8, 9.[28] Ambrose is the first who seems to recommend such a worship;[29] and after his time we find many marks of adoration paid them; though much fewer than to the saints.

The *cross*, always a highly honored symbol among the Christians, had been more superstitiously venerated ever since Constantine attributed his victory over Maxentius to its influence.[30] But after the true cross had been discovered by Helena (A. D. 326),[31] and the

---

nes in Luc. hom. 17: — *Basilius* Ep. 260. (*al.* 317) ad Optimum. *Chrysostomus* Hom. 45, in Matth. and Hom. 21, in Joh. *Augustin.* de nat. et grat. c. 36.

[27] See *Epiphan. hær.* 78, § 23. *Hær.* 79, *Anacephal.* c. 79. Comp. Walchs Ketzerhistorie Th. 3. S. 625 ff. *F. Münter* de Collyridianis in the *Miscellanea Hafniensia* T. I. *Fasc.* 2. *Hafn.* 1818. p. 153 seq. Their heresy was this: ἀντὶ θεοῦ ταύτην παρεισάγειν σπουδάζοντες — ὡς εἰς ὄνομα τῆς ἀειπαρθένου κολλυρίδα τινὰ ἐπιτελεῖν, καὶ συνάγεσθαι ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, — καὶ εἰς ὄνομα αὐτῆς ἱερουργεῖν διὰ γυναικῶν. This usage is, perhaps, explained by *Conc. Quinisexti can.* 79: "The birth of the virgin was ἀλόχευτος: hence no cake (σεμίδαλις) shall be presented after the birth-day of Christ, προφάσει τιμῆς λοχειῶν τῆς ἀχράντου παρθενομήτορος."

[28] *Concil. Laodic. can.* 35: ὅτι οὐ δεῖ Χριστιανοὺς ἐγκαταλείπειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀπιέναι καὶ ἀγγέλους ὀνομάζειν κ. τ. λ. *Dionys. exig.* translates: — atque angelos (var. lect. *angulos*) nominare. *cf. Theodoret. ad Coloss.* ii. 18: Οἱ τῷ νόμῳ συνηγορεῦντες, καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους σέβειν αὐτοῖς εἰσηγεῦντο, διὰ τούτων λέγοντες δεδόσθαι τὸν νόμον. ἔμενε δὲ τοῦτο τὸ πάθος ἐν τῇ Φρυγίᾳ καὶ Πισιδίᾳ μέχρι πολλοῦ· οὗ δὴ χάριν καὶ συνεληθοῦσα σύνοδος ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ τῆς Φρυγίας νόμῳ κεκώλυκε τὸ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις προσεύχεσθαι· καὶ μέχρι δὲ τοῦ νῦν εὐκτήρια τοῦ ἁγίου Μιχαὴλ παρ' ἐκείνοις καὶ τοῖς ὁμόροις ἐκείνων ἐστὶν ἰδεῖν· τοῦτο τοίνυν συνεβούλευον ἐκεῖνοι γίνεσθαι, ταπεινοφροσύνῃ δῆθεν κεχρημένοι, καὶ λέγοντες, ὡς ἄοπτος ὁ τῶν ὅλων θεὸς ἀνέφικτός τε καὶ ἀκατάληπτος, καὶ προσήκει διὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων τὴν θείαν εὐμένειαν πραγματεύεσθαι. *Augustini* confess. X. 42: Quem invenirem, qui me reconciliaret tibi? Abeundum mihi fuit ad angelos? Multi conantes ad te redire, neque per se ipsos valentes, sicut audio, tentaverunt hæc, et inciderunt in desiderium curiosarum visionum, et digni habiti sunt illusionibus, cf. *Keilii* opusc. acad. T. II. p. 548 seq.

[29] *Ambros. de viduis* c. 9: Obsecrandi sunt angeli, qui nobis ad præsidium dati sunt. Comp. *Keil* l. c. p. 562 seq.

[30] *Euseb. de vit. Const.* I. 40; II. 6—9, 16; IV. 21. *Sozom.* I. 8 in fine.

[31] Eusebius *de vit. Constant.* III. 25 seq. relates at great length the clearing out of the Holy Sepulchre, but says nothing of the discovery of the cross. The same is the case with the author of the *Itinerarium*, who visited Jerusalem A. D. 333 (Vetera Rom. itineraria ed. *P. Wesseling*, p. 593). It is first mentioned by Cyril of Jerusalem, in epist. ad Constantium (A. D. 351), the genuineness of which has been doubted, however, by *Salmacius* de cruce, *Dallæus* de cultus relig. objecto, Lib. V. c. 1. *Witsius* Miscell. Sacr. T. II. Exerc. XII. § 27, and others, as not found in *Hieronymus* catal. s. v. Cyrillus. The circumstances of the discovery of the true cross are very differently related by *Ambrose.* Orat. de obitu Theodosii, *Jo. Chrysostomus* hom. 85 (*al.* 84), *Paulinus Nolanus* Epist. 31 (*al.* 11), *Rufinus* hist. eccl. X. 7, 8, *Socrates* I. 17, *Sozomenus* II. 1 (who first mentions Cyril's letter), *Sulpic. Severus* hist. sacr. II. 34. Comp. *Dallæus* and *Witsius* ll. cc.

miraculous cures wrought by fragments from it,[32] and even by pictures of it, it became an object of the deepest adoration, and at last fragments of it were placed on the altars.[33]

The first instance of a pilgrimage to Palestine was that of Helena, which was soon imitated.[34] But such gross superstitions were afterwards connected with this subject,[35] that by many of the most influential teachers in the church, pilgrimages were openly discouraged.[36]

In the 4th century the worship of *images* was still abominated as a heathen practice.[37] At first historical pictures, the subjects of

---

[32] *Paulinus Nolanus Ep.* 31 (*al.* 11): The bishop of Jerusalem alone could bestow bequests of the cross ad magnam fidei et benedictionis gratiam. Quæ quidem crux in materia insensata vim vivam tenens, ita ex illo tempore innumeris pæne quotidie hominum votis lignum suum commodat, ut detrimenta non sentiat, et quasi intacta permaneat.

[33] First mentioned by *Sozomenus* II. 3, cf. Bingham vol. III. p. 236.

[34] Partly in order to be baptized in Jordan (*Euseb.* de locis Ebr. s. v. Βηθαβαρά), which was also the purpose of Constantine (*Euseb.* de vit. Const. IV. 62): but also attracted by the love of the marvellous. *Paulinus Nol. Ep.* 11: the holy cross was shown only at Easter, nisi interdum religiosissimi postulent, qui hac tantum causa illo peregrinati advenerint, ut sibi ejus revelatio quasi in pretium longinquæ peregrinationis deferatur. *Epist.* 36: religiosa cupiditas est loca videre, in quibus Christus ingressus et passus est, et resurrexit, et unde conscendit: et aut de ipsis locis exiguum pulverem, aut de ipso Crucis ligno aliquid saltem festuceæ simile sumere et habere, benedictio est. As the wood of the cross was not diminished by what was taken from it (note 32), so the footsteps of our Lord at his ascension were never worn away, *Sulpic. Sever.* hist. sacr. II. 33: cum quotidie confluentium fides certatim Domino calcata diripiat, damnum tamen arena non sentit: et eadem adhuc sui speciem, velut impressis signata vestigiis, terra custodit.

[35] e. g. *Augustin* de civ. Dei XXII. 8, of the wonderful power of the terra sancta de Hierosolymis allata.

[36] *Hieron.* ep. 13, ad Paulinum: Non Hierosolymis fuisse, sed Hierosolymis bene vixisse laudandum est. — Et de Hierosolymis et de Britannia æqualiter patet aula cœlestis. — Beatus Hilarion cum Palæstinus esset et in Palæstina viveret: uno tantum die vidit Hierosolymam, ut nec contemnere loca sancta propter viciniam, nec rursus dominum loco claudere videretur. (On the other hand, he says, epist. 47, ad Desiderium: adorasse, ubi steterunt pedes domini, pars fidei est, et quasi recentia nativitatis et crucis ac passionis vidisse vestigia). Especially *Gregorii Nysseni*, against pilgrimages, Epist. περὶ τῶν ἀπιόντων εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, reprinted also as an appendix to *J. H. Heidegger* de peregrinationibus religiosis. Turici 1670, 8vo.

[37] cf. § 70, note 5, *Euseb. Cæsariensis ep. ad Constantiam* (Conc. Nicæni II. Actio 6. More complete in the notes to Nicephori Gregoræ Byzant. histor. T. II. p. 795, ed. Paris): Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ περί τινος εἰκόνος ὡς δὴ τοῦ Χριστοῦ γέγραφας, εἰκόνα βουλομένη σοι ταύτην ὑφ' ἡμῶν πεμφθῆναι· τίνα λέγεις καὶ ποίαν ταύτην, ἣν φῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰκόνα; — πότερον τὴν ἀληθῆ καὶ ἀμετάλλακτον, καὶ φύσει τοὺς αὐτοῦ χαρακτῆρας φέρουσαν· ἢ ταύτην ἣν δι' ἡμᾶς ἀνείληφε, τῆς τοῦ δούλου μορφῆς περιθέμενος τὸ σχῆμα; — ἀλλὰ τοῦ πρὸ τῆς μεταβολῆς σαρκίου αὐτοῦ δὴ τοῦ θνητοῦ τὴν εἰκόνα φῆς παρ' ἡμῶν αἰτεῖν· ἄρα γὰρ τοῦτο σε μόνον διέλαθεν τὸ ἀνάγνωσμα, ἐν ᾧ ὁ Θεὸς νομοθετεῖ μὴ ποιεῖν ὁμοίωμα μήτε τῶν, ὅσα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, μήτε τῶν ὅσα ἐν τῇ γῇ κάτω; ἢ ἔστιν ὅτε ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ τὸ τοιοῦτον ἢ αὐτὴ, ἢ καὶ παρ' ἄλλου τοῦτο ἠκουσας; οὐχὶ δὲ καθ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐξῴρισται καὶ πόρρω τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν πεφυγάδευται τὰ τοιαῦτα, μόνοις τε ἡμῖν μὴ ἐξεῖναι τὸ τοιοῦτον ποιεῖν παρὰ πᾶσι βεβόηται; — οὐκ οἶδα γὰρ, ὅπως γύναιόν τι μιτὰ χεῖρας ποτε δύο τινὰς φέρουσα καταγεγραμμένους, ὡς ἂν φιλοσόφους, ἀπέῤῥιψε λόγον, ὡς ἂν εἶεν Παύλου καὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος· οὐκ ἔχω λέγειν, οὔτε ὁπόθεν λαβοῦσα, οὔτε ὅθεν τοῦτο μαθοῦσα· ἵνα μηδὲ αὐτὴ, ἕτερα σκανδαλίζοντο, ἀφιλόμενος ταύτην παρ' ἐμαυτὸν κατεῖχον, οὐχ' ἡγούμενος καλῶς ἔχειν εἰς ἑτέρους ὅλως ἐκφέρειν ταῦτα, ἵνα μὴ δοκῶμεν

which were taken from the Scriptures, or from the history of the martyrs, were allowed in the churches. Of these the earliest instances are mentioned by Gregory of Nyssa in the East,[38] and by Paulinus, bishop of Nola (A. D. 409 – 431), in the West.[39] Such pictures were not intended to be worshipped,[40] but only for ornament, and for the instruction of the illiterate; but as early as the 5th century various superstitions had come to be connected with them.[41]

δίκην εἰδωλολατρούντων τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν ἐν εἰκόνι περιφέρειν. *Epiphanius Ep. ad Johannem Hierosol. ex vers. Hieronymi (Epiph. Opp.* T. II. p. 317) relates, that having come into Anablatha, a village in Palestine, inveni ibi velum pendens in foribus ejusdem Ecclesiæ tinctum atque depictum, et habens imaginem, quasi Christi, vel sancti cujusdam. Non enim satis memini, cujus imago fuerit. Cum ergo hoc vidissem, in Ecclesia Christi contra auctoritatem Scripturarum hominis pendere imaginem, scidi illud, et magis dedi consilium custodibus ejusdem loci, ut pauperem mortuum eo obvolverent et efferrent. He promised them a new curtain which he herewith sent, and begged John, deinceps præcipere, in Ecclesia Christi ejusmodi vela, quæ contra religionem nostram veniunt, non appendi. *Asterius*, bishop of Amasea (about A. D. 400, see his homilies in the Auctarium PP. ed. Combefisii) hom. in Divitem et Lazarum: Μὴ γράφε τὸν Χριστὸν· ἀρκεῖ γὰρ αὐτῷ ἡ μία τῆς ἐνσωματώσεως ταπεινοφροσύνη, ἣν αὐθαιρέτως δι' ἡμᾶς κατδέξατο· ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς σου βαστάζων νοητῶς τὸν ἀσώματον λόγον περίφερε. cf. *Suiceri* thesaur. eccl. T. I. p. 1014 seq. Neanders Chrysostomus Bd. 2. S. 143 ff.

[38] *Greg. Nyss.* orat. de laudibus Theodori Mart. c. 2 (Opp. T. II. p. 1011), in describing the church built in honor of Theodore: Ἐπίχρωσι δὲ καὶ ζωγράφος τὰ ἄνθη τῆς τέχνης ἐν εἰκόνι διαγραψάμενος, τὰς ἀριστείας τοῦ μάρτυρος, τὰς ἐνστάσεις, τὰς ἀλγηδόνας, τὰς θηριώδεις τῶν συράννων μορφὰς, τὰς ἐπηρείας, τὴν φλογοτρόφον ἐκείνην κάμινον, τὴν μακαριωτάτην τελείωσιν τοῦ ἀθλητοῦ, τοῦ ἀγωνοθέτου Χριστοῦ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης μορφῆς τὸ ἐκτύπωμα· πάντα ἡμῖν, ὡς ἐν βιβλίῳ τινί γλωττοφόρῳ, διὰ χρωμάτων τεχνουργηθέντα σαφῶς διηγόρευσε τοὺς ἀγῶνας τοῦ μάρτυρος. In the *Orat. de Deitate Filii et Spir. s.* (l. c. p. 908) he describes a picture of the sacrifice of Isaac, compare Cramers Forts. v. Bossuets Weltgesch. Th. 4. S. 442 ff. Münters Sinnbilder u. Kunstvorstellungen der alten Christen Heft 1. S. 9 ff.

[39] *Paulin.* natal. IX. Felicis.

Propterea visum nobis opus utile, totis
Felicibus domibus pictura illudere sancta:
Si forte attonitas hæc per spectacula mentes
Agrestum caperet fucata coloribus umbra, etc.

cf. *Natalis* VII. and X. Epist. 30 (al. 12) *Prudentius* περὶ στεφανῶν Hymn. IX. v. 10; Hymn. XI. v. 127. Münter, l. c. S. 10.

[40] Thus *Augustine* mentions pictures of Abraham (c. *Faust.* XXII. 73), of Peter and Paul (de consensu evangel. I. 10), but says in the last passage: Sic omnino errare meruerunt, qui Christum et Apostolos ejus non in sanctis codicibus, sed in pictis parietibus quæsierunt, and mentions (de morib. eccl. cath. I. 34) the worship sepulchrorum et picturarum as a superstition.

[41] According to *Theodoreti* hist. relig. c. 26 (ed. *Schultze*, T. III. p. 1272), Simeon Stylita was held in such honor even during his lifetime, ὡς ἐν ἅπασι τοῖς τῶν ἐργαστηρίων προπυλαίοις εἰκόνας αὐτῷ βραχείας ἀναστῆσαι, φυλακήν τινα σφίσιν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀσφάλειαν ἐντεῦθεν πορίζοντας. The Capita radiata or the Nimbus was borrowed from the heathen, see *Schœpflini* commentt. hist. et crit. p. 69. Münters Sinnbilder Heft 2. S. 20 ff. — The Thomas Christians in India supposed that Cyril introduced the, to them so hateful, pictures, see *La Croze* Hist. du christianisme des Indes à la Haye, 1724. 4to. p. 243. *Assemanus* Bibl. Orient. T. III. P. II. p. 401, tries to prove that this must be a comparatively modern tradition. It is, however, a remarkable fact, that this tradition is related by the *Copt. Elmacin* (about A. D. 1250), on whose authority it is repeated by *Makriz*, about 1400 (see *Renaudet* hist. Patr. Alex. p. 114. *Makrizii* hist. Coptorum, ed. *Wetzer*. 1828. 8vo.).

§ 98.

OF THE CHURCHES, FASTS, AND FESTIVALS.

The churches, from the end of the 4th century called also *basilicæ*,[1] had now become large and splendid. They were divided into three parts: the *porch* (*πύρθηξ* or *πρόναος*), from which the 'beautiful gates' (*πύλαι ὡραῖαι*, Acts iii. 2 – 10) led into the *body of the church* (*ναὸς*, navis, where was the *ἄμβων* or pulpit), which again was divided from the *sacristy* (*βῆμα*, sacrarium) by a lattice-work (cancelli, *κιγκλίδες*). There were usually other buildings attached to the churches, and especially a *baptistery*, with a fount (*κολυμβήθρα*, piscina). All the buildings were inclosed in a court (*αἴθριον, αὐλή*, atrium), where was also a reservoir, or large vessel, of water (*κρήνη*, cantharus) for washing the hands before entering the church, after the ancient Jewish fashion.

The Fasts, hitherto voluntary, were now prescribed by the church at stated times.[2] The Festivals were now more equally distributed, and at the same time multiplied. In the Eastern church both the birth and the baptism of our Lord were celebrated on the Epiphany;[3]

---

[1] The name was first peculiar to those churches which had formerly been basilicæ, and those built on the same model, hence *Hieronymus*, Ep. 35. Epitaph. Nepotiani: basilicas ecclesiæ.

[2] The older view (see § 71) is still retained by *Victor Antiochenus* (about 400) comm. in Ev. Marci, c. 2 (Bibl. PP. max. T. IV.): Enimvero inter eos, qui in Moysis, et eos rursum, qui in gratiæ lege jejuniis dant operam, hoc præter cætera interest, quod illi quidem jejunia a Deo præfinita habebant, quæ proinde modis omnibus explere obligabantur, etiamsi alias noluissent; hi vero virtutis amore, liberaque voluntatis electione jejunant verius, quam ulla legis coactione. Quodsi vero quadragesimale vel aliud quodcunque jejunium definitum habemus, propter ignavos et negligentes, quo nimirum quoque ii officium faciant, præfinitum habemus. *Chrysostomus hom.* LII. *in eos qui primo Pascha jejunant. Cassianus collat.* XXI. c. 30: Sciendum sane hanc observantiam quadragesimæ, quamdiu ecclesiæ illius primitivæ perfectio inviolata permansit, penitus non fuisse. Non enim præcepti hujus necessitate nec quasi legali sanctione constricti, arctissimis jejuniorum terminis claudebantur, qui totum anni spatium æquali jejunio concludebant. *Socrates* V. 22. But *Epiphan.* hær. LXXV. 6. Expos. fidei c. 22, traces back the Wednesday's and Friday's fasts to the apostles. *Hieronymus* Ep. 27 (al. 54) ad Marcellam: Nos unam quadragesimam secundum traditionem Apostolorum, toto nobis orbe congruo, jejunamus. *Leo P.* Serm. 43. de Quadrages. 6: Apostolica institutio XL. dierum jejunio impleatur. — Whilst in the Oriental church all fasting was prohibited on the Saturday, in the Western, and especially at Rome, it became, from the 3d century, the customary day for fasts (see Neander K. G. Bd. 1. Abth. 2. S. 515): in the 4th century it entirely took the place of Wednesday (*Innocent.* I. Ep. 25 ad Decentium, c. 4) cf. Quesnel diss. de jejunio Sabbati in Eccl. Rom. observato in his edition of the Opp. Leonis, T. II. p. 544.

[3] *Cassian.* collat. X. c. 2: Intra Ægypti regionem mos iste antiqua traditione servatur, ut peracto Epiphaniorum die, quem provinciæ illius sacerdotes, vel dominici baptismi, vel secundum carnem nativitatis esse definiunt, et idcirco utriusque sacramenti solemnitatem non bifarie, ut in occiduis provinciis, sed sub una diei hujus festivitate concelebrant, epistolæ pontificis Alexandrini per universas dirigantur Ægypti ecclesias, quibus et initium quadragesimæ et dies paschæ non solum per civitates omnes, sed etiam per universa monasteria designentur.

but in the Western church the 25th of December had been adopted as the birthday ever since the middle of the 4th century,[4] and the Epiphany observed only as the day of baptism. This custom began now to obtain also in the East;[5] and at last (just before the year 341) in Egypt also.[6] The celebration of the passover as common in Asia Minor had been condemned at the council of Nice,[7] and since that time those, who still retained it, were accounted heretics (Quartodecimani).[8] The appointment of Easter Sunday was, for the most part, left to the patriarch of Alexandria;[9] yet not always, especially in the West, and thus Easter was sometimes observed on different days in different provinces.[10] The time for this festival was announced

---

[4] According to Epist. *Johannis* Epist. Nic. in the Auctar. Bibl. Patr. ed. *Combeficius*, T. II. p. 297, and an anonymous writer in *Cotelerius* ad Constitt. Apost. V. 13, this day was established by Julius, bishop of Rome, A. D. 337–352: and though these writers are not old enough to be considered as witnesses, they cannot be far from the truth: cf. *Jablonski* de origine festi nativit. Christi diss. I. § 9. Opusc. ed. *te Water*, T. III. p. 334 seq. It was suggested by *John Harduin*, and the probability of the suggestion made more evident by *Jablonski*, l. c. diss. II. § 2. p. 348 seq., that the choice of the day was decided by its being the day of the natalis solis invicti.

[5] For instance, in Antioch, about A. D. 380. Chrysost. hom. 31. de natali Christi (ed. Montfauc. T. II. p. 355): *οὕτω δίκαιόν ἐστιν ἔτος, ἐξ οὗ δήλη καὶ γνώριμος ἡμῖν αὕτη ἡ ἡμέρα γεγέννηται.* What follows furnishes a remarkable illustration of the ease with which customs of a recent date could assume the character and name of apostolic institutions: *παρὰ μὲν τοῖς τὴν ἑσπέραν οἰκοῦσιν ἄνωθεν γνωριζομένη — παλαιὰ καὶ ἀρχαία ἐστὶ, καὶ ἄνωθεν τοῖς ἀπὸ Θρᾴκης μέχρι Γαδείρων οἰκοῦσι κατάδηλος καὶ ἐπίσημος γέγονε.*

[6] Compare *Cassian.* collat. X. 2, note 3. On the other hand, in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus (Mansi T. V. p. 293) Pauli Episc. Emiseni homilia λεχθεῖσα κθ' Χοιὰκ (25 Dec.) *ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ* 'Αλεξανδρείας — *εἰς τὴν γέννησιν τοῦ Κυρίου κ. τ. λ.*

[7] *Constantini Epist. in Theodoreti* h. e. I. 9, and *Epist. Syn. Nic. ad Eccl. Alexandr. Socrates* I. 9. *ὡς πάντας τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἑῳᾳ ἀδελφοὺς, τοὺς μετὰ τῶν 'Ιουδαίων τὸ πρότερον ποιοῦντας, συμφώνως 'Ρωμαίοις καὶ ἡμῖν — τὸ πάσχα ἐκ τοῦ δεῦρο ἄγειν.* There is nothing more precise on the subject. The decree was confirmed by the *Conc. Antioch.* ann. 341. can. 1.

[8] The name first occurs, Conc. Laodic. (about 364) can. 7. Conc. Constant. œc. II. ann. 381. c. 2. *Epiphan.* hær. 50. On the other hand *Philastrius*, hær. 87, knows nothing of it.

[9] *Leonis* Ep. 121 (ed. Quesn. 94): Paschale festum — quamvis in primo semper mense celebrandum sit, ita tamen est lunaris cursus conditione mutabile, ut plerumque sacratissimæ diei ambigua occurrat electio, et ex hoc fiat plerumque quod non licet, ut non simul omnis Ecclesia quod nonnisi unum esse oportet, observet. Studuerunt itaque sancti Patres occasionem hujus erroris auferre, omnem hanc curam Alexandrino Episcopo delegantes (quoniam apud Ægyptios hujus supputationis antiquitus tradita esse videbatur peritia), per quem quotannis dies prædictæ solemnitatis Sedi apostolicæ indicaretur, cujus scriptis ad longinquiores Ecclesias indicium generale percurreret.

[10] *Ambrosius Ep.* 23 (al. 83). Concerning the different Cycles, see *Bingham*, Lib. XX. c. 5. § 4 (vol. IX. p. 90). In Alexandria the Cycle of 19 years, invented by Anatolius, was used; in Rome to the time of Leo the Great, and in all the West, the Jewish Cyclus of 84 years. With the Alexandrians, Easter must fall between the 22 March and the 25 April, with the Latins, between the 20 March and the 23 April. This want of uniformity occasioned the application of the bishop *Leo M. Ep.* 121 (see note 9) to the emperor Marcian: obsecro

at the Epiphany. It was preceded by forty days of preparation (*τεσσαρακοστή*),[11] and distinguished into the week of the crucifixion (*πάσχα σταυρώσιμον*, hebdomas magna), and the week of the resurrection (*πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον*), and ended with the dominica in albis. This festival was followed by the Quinquagesima (*πεντηκοστή*); a term of fifty days, which included the Ascension, and ended with the day of Pentecost.[12]

On the night preceding a festival there was always a service in the churches (vigiliæ); of these the Easter-vigils were the most splendid.[13]

§ 99.

RITES AND CEREMONIES.

Christian worship was now invested with a new splendor. The clergy began to wear a peculiar costume whilst engaged in their public services.[1] Frankincense, which had always been used as a mark of honor to the emperor, or other distinguished personages,[2] was introduced into the churches. Candles were often used in the day-time. More attention was paid to the music in the church. The custom of singing in responses, which began at Antioch,[3] soon

---

clementiam vestram, ut studium vestrum præstare dignemini: quatenus Ægyptii, vel si qui sunt alii, qui certam hujus supputationis videntur habere notitiam, scrupulum hujus sollicitudinis absolvant, ut in eum diem generalis observantia dirigatur, qui nec paternarum constitutionum normam relinquat, nec ultra præfixos terminos evagetur. Quicquid autem pietas vestra de hac consultatione cognoverit, ad meam jubeat mox notitiam pervenire, ut in divinis mysteriis nulla dissonantiæ culpa nascatur.

[11] Amongst the Orientals seven weeks, amongst the Occidentals, who fasted also on the Sabbath (see note 2), six; in both cases, therefore, 36 days. *Cassiani collat.* XXI. 24, 25 (qui substantiarum nostrarum omniumque fructuum decimas offerre præcipimur, multo magis necesse est, ut ipsius quoque conversationis nostræ, et humani usus, operumque nostrorum decimas offeremus, quæ profecto in supputatione quadragesimæ implentur), 27, 28. Compare *Socrates* V. 22.

[12] *Augustini Ep.* 118 *ad Januarium:* Illa quæ non scripta, sed tradita custodimus, quæ quidem toto terrarum orbe observantur, datur intelligi, vel ab ipsis apostolis, vel plenariis conciliis, quorum in ecclesia saluberrima auctoritas, commendata atque statuta reperiri. Sicut quod Domini passio et resurrectio, et *adscensio in cœlum,* et adventus de cœlo spiritus sancti anniversaria solemnitate celebrantur. Augustine is the first who speaks of the Ascension in the West, and Chrysostom in the East, see *Bingham*, vol. IX. p. 126.

[13] *Euseb. de vit. Const.* IV. 22. *Gregor. Nyss. Orat.* 5. *de Paschate. Gregor. Naz. Orat.* 19 et 42.

[1] All the clergy wore the *στιχάριον* (vestis alba, tunica); bishops, presbyters, and deacons wore the *ὠράριον* (orarium) over that; bishops and presbyters the *φελόνης*, or *φαιλόνης* (planeta, casula) over that. The *ὠμοφόριον* (pallium) distinguished the bishops in the East; in the West it was not yet in use (cf. *Pertsch* de origine, usu et auctoritate pallii archiepiscopalis. Helmst. 1754. 4to.)

[2] Compare § 97, note 3.

[3] According to *Theodoretus* h. e. II. 19, Flavianus and Diodorus, two monks of Antioch, in the time of Constantine, were its originators. *οὗτοι πρῶτοι, διχῇ διελόντες τοὺς τῶν ψαλλόντων χορούς, ἐκ διαδοχῆς ᾄδειν τὴν Δαυιτικὴν ἐδίδαξαν μελῳδίαν· καὶ τοῦτο*

became common in the Eastern church, and was introduced into the Western by Ambrose.[4] The distinction between the initiated and the uninitiated (disciplina arcani) was now carried to its greatest extreme.[5] In the Latin church all public worship was called *missa*,[6] and distinguished into *missa catechumenorum*, and *missa fidelium*.

The rite of baptism, now always preceded by unction,[7] was often deferred by those to be baptized as long as possible; as we see by the zealous remonstrances of various teachers in the church against the practice.[8] The baptism of infants did not become universal till after the time of Augustine.

As to the Lord's Supper, the Christians of that age speak of the transformation of the bread and wine into the flesh and blood of Christ, but only in a figurative sense.[9] As this rite was looked upon in the light

---

ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ πρῶτον ἀρξάμενον πάντοσε διέδραμε, καὶ κατέλαβε τῆς οἰκουμένης τά τέρματα. According to *Theodorus Mopsvest.* in *Nicetæ Acomin. thesaurus orthodoxiæ* V. 30, they first only translated Antiphonies from the Syriac into Greek, and *Socrates* VI. 8, attributes the first introduction of music to Ignatius (*Augusti diss. de hymnis Syrorum. Vratisl.* 1814. 8vo. Hahn über den Gesang in der syrichen Kirche, in dem Kirchenhist. Archive für 1823, Heft 3. S. 52 ff.) The custom of singing in responses was spread abroad by the monks especially (τὸ ἀντίφωνον· ἀντίφωνοι ὕμνοι). Compare *M. Gerbertus de cantu et musica sacra* (Tomi II. *typis San-Blasianis*, 1774. 4to. T. I. p. 40 seq.

[4] *Augustini confess.* IX. 7, *Paulinus in vita Ambros.* p. IV.

[5] *Basilius de spir. sancto*, c. 27. Compare especially *Cyrilli Hieros.* catecheses. Hence the expression, so frequent among the Greek orators, ἴσασιν οἱ μεμυημένοι.

[6] First perhaps *Conc. Carthag.* II. ann. 390. can. 3 (reconciliare quemquam publica missa presbytero non licere). Missa i. e. missio, as remissa, offensa for remissio, offensio. *Avitus* (archbishop of Vienna about A. D. 490) in *Epist.* I: in Ecclesiis Palatiisque, sive Prætoriis missa fieri pronunciatur, cum populus ab observatione dimittitur. cf. *Bingham.* T. V. p. 6 seq. — Was it not originally missio precum? mittere or emittere preces, like ἀναπέμπειν, *Justin. Apol.* I. c. 65. *Euseb. histor. eccl.* IV. 15, 13.

[7] *Constitt. Apostoll.* VII. c. 41. *Cyrill. Hieros. catech. myst.* II. c. 3 and 4. This unction was ἐλαίῳ ἁγίῳ, that after baptism, which had been long usual (see § 52, note 23), μύρῳ or χρίσματι, see *Suicer thes. eccl.* s. v. ἔλαιον no. II. 2. and χρίσμα no. II. *Bingham* lib. XI. c. 9 (vol. IV. p. 303 seq.).

[8] *Gregor. Nazianz.* Orat. 40. Compare Ullmanns Gregor. v. Naz. S. 466 ff. (On the baptism of children, δίδωμι γνώμην, τὴν τριετίαν ἀναμείναντας — ἡνίκα καὶ ἀκοῦσαί τι μυστικὸν, καὶ ἀποκρίνεσθαι δυνατόν — οὕτως ἁγιάζειν). *Basilii M.* orat. 13. (*Walli* hist. bapt. infant. P. I. p. 136 seq.; 181 seq.) Chrysostomus (Neanders Chrys. Bd. 1. S. 74 ff.).

[9] We find the expressions, μεταβολὴ, μεταβάλλεσθαι, μεταμορφοῦσθαι, μεταστοιχειοῦσθαι (similar expressions with regard to the consecrated oil, Münscher Th. 4. S. 387, and the water for baptism, Ebend. S. 352. Wundemann, Th. 2. S. 417), also τύπος, ἀντίτυπον, figura, signum. Hence all the disputing parties appeal to the authority of the Fathers. Compare especially the controversy between A. Arnauld, P. Nicole (chief work, la perpétuité de la foi de l'église catholique touchant l'eucharistie, 3 T. 1669 – 1672. T. 4 et 5 par *Eus. Renaudot*, 1711 – 1713. 4to.), and J. Claude (Réponse aux deux traités intitulés: la perpétuité, etc. Charent. 1666. Réponse au livre de Mr. Arnauld intitulé: la perpétuité, etc. Charent. 1671. 2 voll. 8vo. — *R. Hospiniani* historia sacramentaria (T. II. Tigur. 1602. Genev. 1681. fol.) T. I. *J. A. Ernesti* Antimuratorius 1755 (recus. in ejusd. Opusc. theol. Lips. 1773. p. 1 seq.). Distinct passages on this subject are: Chrysostomi *epist. ad Cæsarium*, first pointed out by Petrus Martyr, *prim. ed. Bigot.*

of a sacrifice,[10] the idea was naturally suggested that God could be thus propitiated, which frequently led to superstitious abuses even at this early period.[11] It was now celebrated with great splendor, consisted of various parts, and was conducted according to fixed forms.[12]

---

appended to *Palladii vit. Chrys.*, see § 83, note 6 (erased by royal command. See *Chaufepié* and *Boyle Dictionnaire*, *Art. Bigot.*), reprinted from a more correct copy of the Florentine codex by Scipio Maffeus, and accompanied with Greek fragments, in *Canisii* lectt. ant. ed. *Basnage* T. I. p. 235. (cf. *J. E. Kappii* diss. de celeberrima S. Jo. Chrysostomi ad Cæsarium Mon. Epistola. Lips. 1723. 4to. *Deylingii* Observatt. miscell. P. I. 361 seq. doubts of its authenticity, Münscher Bd. 4. S. 389): antequam sanctificetur panis, panem nominamus, divina autem illam sanctificante gratia, mediante sacerdote, liberatus est quidem appellatione panis, dignus autem habitus est dominici corporis appellatione, *etiamsi natura panis in ipso permansit.* — AUGUSTINUS *Epist.* 98 (al. 23) *ad Bonifacium*, § 9: Nempe sæpe ita loquimur, ut Pascha propinquante dicamus, crastinam vel perendinam Domini passionem, cum ille ante tam multos annos passus sit, nec omnino nisi semel illa passio facta sit. — Nonne semel immolatus est Christus in se ipso, et tamen in sacramento non solum per omnes Paschæ solemnitates, sed omni die populis immolatur, nec utique mentitur, qui interrogatus cum responderit immolari? Si enim sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum, quarum sacramenta sunt, non haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt. Sicut ergo secundum quendam modum sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est, ita sacramentum fidei fides est. *Contra Adimantum Manich.* c. 12: Non enim Dominus dubitavit dicere *hoc est corpus meum*, cum signum daret corporis sui. *Ad Ps.* III: figuram corporis et sanguinis sui. cf. *Contra Faustum* XX. c. 18 and 21. *De Doctrina Christiana* III. 16. Fragment in *Fulgentius* in *Bibl. max.* PP. T. IX. p. 177 seq. Whilst the Catholics in general endeavour to explain away these passages by forced interpretations, *P. de Marca*, in his *Traité du sacrement de l'Eucharistie* (published after his death by his relation, *Paul Faget*, Paris, 1668, and though suppressed, soon after republished in the Netherlands), admits that the Fathers to Chrysostom and Augustine, expressly, did not teach the doctrine of transubstantiation: acknowledging the genuineness of *Chrysostom. Ep. ad Cæsar.* THEODORETI *Eranistes* dial. II (ed. Schulze T. IV. p. 126): *οὐδὲ μετὰ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν τὰ μυστικὰ σύμβολα τῆς οἰκείας ἐξίσταται φύσεως· μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας καὶ τοῦ σχήματος, καὶ τοῦ εἴδους· — νοεῖται δὲ ἅπερ ἐγένετο, καὶ πιστεύεται καὶ προσκυνεῖται, ὡς ἐκεῖνα ὄντα ἅπερ πιστεύεται.* Comp. Münscher Bd. 4. S. 377 ff. Wundemann Th. 2. S. 419 ff. — That the cup was still given to the laity, vid. *Leo* I. Sermo IV. de Quadrages. (§ 84, note 6) *Chrysostom.* in epist. II. ad Cor. hom. 18: *ἔστι δὲ ὅπου οὐδὲ διίστηκεν ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ ἀρχομένου, οἷον ὅταν ἀπολαύειν δεῖ τῶν φρικτῶν μυστηρίων· ὁμοίως γὰρ πάντες ἀξιούμεθα τῶν αὐτῶν· οὐ καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς τὰ μὲν ὁ ἱερεὺς ἤσθιε, τὰ δὲ ὁ ἀρχόμενος, καὶ θέμις οὐκ ἦν τῷ λαῷ μετέχειν, ὧν μετεῖχεν ὁ ἱερεύς· ἀλλ' οὐ νῦν· ἀλλὰ πᾶσιν ἓν σῶμα πρόκειται, καὶ ποτήριον ἕν.*

[10] In what manner, see Münscher Bd. 4. S. 400 ff. Wundemann Th. 2. S. 441. Neander, K. G. II. 2. 707 ff.

[11] Especially as the bread was often taken home. Thus a certain Acatius relates to Augustine (*August. opus Imp. contra Julian.* III. c. 162) that he was born blind, and a surgeon was about to perform an operation for him, neque hoc permisisse religiosam matrem suam, sed id effecisse imposito ex Eucharistia cataplasmate. Compare *Gregor. Naz. Orat.* 8. § 17, 18 (al. Or. 11. p. 186 seq.) *in laudem Gorgoniæ. Epist.* 240. Compare Münscher Bd. 4. S. 403. Wundemann Th. 2. S. 446. Neand. l. c.

[12] *Λειτουργία*, see Suicer s. v. no. II. 2. The liturgies of Basil and Chrysostom, especially, were much used in the East, though with many variations, and hence the differing texts now found, see *Jac. Goar. εὐχολόγιον, s. rituale Græcorum*, *Paris* 1647, and *Venet.* 1780. fol. *Leonis Allatii de libris ecclesiasticis Græcorum dissertt.* II. *Paris* 1645. 4to. (reprinted with the remarks of *Fabricius* in his *Bibl.*

The Agapæ, or love feasts, had been gradually discontinued since the end of the 4th century, as unsuited to the increased numbers of the believers.[13] p. 304.

CHAPTER SIXTH.

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN MORALS AND MANNERS.

§ 100.

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS.[1]

Staudlins Gesch. d. Sittenlehre Jesu, Bd. 3 — de Wette Gesch. d. christl. Sittenlehre. Erste Halfte, S. 334 ff.

The disposition already manifested in the last period to lay too much stress on the observance of certain forms of external discipline, had now been much increased by the influence of monachism. Fasting and almsgiving,[2] as well as prayer, were thought to have the power of blotting out sins. The theatre, dancing, and other amusements[3] were accounted absolutely sinful; and all oaths,[4] the taking

---

Græca, vol. V. of the old ed.; in the new, by *Harles*, omitted.) *Eus. Renaudotii Liturgiarum orientalium collectio*, Tomi II. Paris, 1716. 4to.

[13] *Concil. Laodiceni*, Can. 28. *Conc. Carthag.* III. c. 30. Prohibition by Ambrose *Augustini confess.* VI. 2. *Ejusd. Epist.* 22 (al. 64) *ad Aurelium.* cf. *Drescher de Agapis comm. Giessæ*, 1824. p. 39 seq.

[1] There was an ancient controversy concerning the morals of the fathers, occasioned by the unfavorable view of *J. Barbeyrac*, in the preface to the translation of Pufendorf: Le droit de la nature et des gens. Amst. 1712. 4to. Answered by *Remig. Heillier* apologie de la morale des pères de l'église contre J. Barb. Paris 1718. 4to. *J. F. Buddeus* isag. ad univers. theolog. p. 620. Rejoinder of *Barbeyrac* traité de la morale des pères de l'église. Amst. 1728. 4to.

[2] Münschers Dogmengesch. Bd. 4. S. 314 ff. de Wette, l. c. S. 354 ff. *Ambrosius de Elia et jejunio*, c. 20: Pecuniam habes, redime peccatum tuum. Non venalis est Dominus, sed tu ipse venalis es: redime te operibus tuis, redime te pecunia tua. Vilis pecunia, sed pretiosa est misericordia. (after *Dan.* iv. 24: peccata tua eleemosynis redime et iniquitates tuas misericordiis pauperum). *Salvianus* (about 450) *adv. avaritiam*, libb. IV. very plainly makes generosity to churches and convents the surest redemtio peccatorum.

[3] De Wette, S. 349 f. Staudlins Gesch. d. Vorstellungen v. d. Sittlichkeit des Schauspiels. Gött. 1823.

[4] By Jerome, Basil, and especially Chrysostom, vid. Staudlins Gesch. d. Sittenlehre Jesu Bd. 3. S. 101, 220, 224. The same, Gesch. d. Vorstellungen u. Lehren vom Eide. Gött. 1824. Hence the clergy were forbidden to take oaths. *Lex Marciani*, A. D. 456 (*Cod. Justin.* I. 3, 25): Ecclesiasticis regulis, et canone a beatissimis Episcopis antiquitus instituto, clerici jurare prohibentur.

of interest for money lent,[5] self-defence,[6] capital punishments,[7] and second marriages[8] reckoned as crimes.

Until the end of the 4th century those who were legally divorced were allowed to marry again,[9] the second marriage being considered no farther objectionable than in other cases; but in the 5th century, the marriage of a divorced person was forbidden during the life of the other party.[10] So prevalent was now the spirit of monachism that the married state began to be considered impure,[11] and only a tolerated evil.[12] Certain articles of food also were forbidden.[13]

---

[5] *Basilius M.* in Ps. 14, et contra fœneratores. *Gregor. Nyss.* Ep. can. ad Letojum can. 6. *Ambrosius* de Tobia, c. 2 seq.

[6] Ambrose, Augustine, Basil, see Stäudlins Gesch. d. Sittenl. Jesu Bd. 3. S. 65, 149, 219.

[7] *Ambrosius* Ep. 25 (al. 58).

[8] Forbidden by Ambrose and Jerome, disadvised by Chrysostom, a state of widowhood preferred by Augustine, cf. *Cotelerius* ad *Hermæ Pastor.* Lib. II. Mand. 4. c. 4. and in *Constitt. Apost.* III. 2. Stäudlin, l. c. S. 60, 92, 141, 146. Hence those who married twice were subjected to penance, *Conc. Neocæsar.* can. 1, 3. *Laodic.* can. 1. *Basilii Epist.* 188 (Ep. can. I.) can. 4. Compare Ep. can. II. c. 50, concerning those who were married three times, and Ep. can. III. c. 80, of those married more than three times.

[9] *Ambrosiaster* in 1 *Cor.* vii. 15: Si infidelis discesserit, liberum habebit arbitrium, si voluerit, nubere legis suæ viro. Contumelia enim creatoris solvit jus matrimonii circa eum, qui relinquitur, etc. *Epiphan. hær.* 59. § 4: *ὁ δὲ μὴ δυνηθεὶς τῇ μιᾷ ἀρκεσθῆναι στελευτησάσῃ, [ἢ] ἕνεκέν τινος προφάσεως, πορνείας ἢ μοιχείας, ἢ κακῆς αἰτίας χωρισμοῦ γενομένου, συναφθέντα δευτέρᾳ γυναικὶ ἢ γυνὴ δευτέρῳ ἀνδρὶ, οὐκ αἰτιᾶται ὁ θεῖος λόγος, οὐδὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῆς ζωῆς ἀποκηρύττει, ἀλλὰ διαβαστάζει διὰ τὸ ἀσθενὲς, οὐχ ἵνα δύο γυναῖκας ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ σχῇ ἔτι περιούσης τῆς μιᾶς, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ μιᾶς ἀποσχεθεὶς, δευτέρᾳ, εἰ τύχοιεν, νόμῳ συναφθῆναι.* cf. *Asterius* § 103, note 14. *Bingham*, vol. IX. p. 301 seq.; 349 seq.

[10] The transition to this view may be traced, *Augustinus de fide et opere*, c. 19: In ipsis divinis sententiis ita obscurum est, utrum et iste, cui quidem sine dubio adulteram licet dimittere, adulter tamen habeatur, si alteram duxerit, ut quantum existimo, venialiter ibi quisque fallatur. Still the *Conc. Milevitanum* II. ann. 416, at which Augustine was present, resolved, without reserve, can. 17: Placuit, ut secundum evangelicam et apostolicam disciplinam, neque dimissus ab uxore, neque dimissa a marito, alteri conjungantur: sed ita maneant, aut sibimet reconcilientur. Quod si contempserint, ad pœnitentiam redigantur. In qua causa legem imperialem petendam promulgari. Such too was the opinion of *Innocentius* I. *Epist.* 6 *ad Exsuperium*, c. 6: De his etiam requisivit dilectio tua, qui interveniente repudio alii se matrimonio copularunt. Quos in utraque parte adulteros esse manifestum est, etc.

[11] Hence such ordinances as *Conc. Carthag.* IV. c. 13, that the newly married, cum benedictionem acceperint, eadem nocte pro reverentia ipsius benedictionis in virginitate permaneant.

[12] *Hieronymus adv. Jovinian.* 1, 4, with reference to 1 *Cor.* vii. 1: Si bonum est mulierem non tangere, malum est ergo tangere: nihil enim bono contrarium est nisi malum. Si autem malum est, et ignoscitur; ideo conceditur, ne malo quid deterius fiat. — Oro te, quale illud bonum est, quod orare prohibet? quod corpus Christi accipi non permittit? Quamdiu impleo mariti officium, non impleo Christiani. Still he was forced to make some concessions in the *Epist.* 30 (al. 50) *ad Pammachium, pro libris adv. Jovinianum Apologia.* e. g. Quum toties et tam crebro lectorem admonuerim, — me ita recipere nuptias, ut continentes viduas virginesque præferrem: debuerat prudens et benignus lector etiam ea, quæ videntur dura, æstimare de cæteris, etc. Augustine is more moderate in the work called forth by this very controversy between Jovian and Jerome, *De bono*

The introduction of such laws, for which no foundation could be shown in the consciousness of mankind, gave to Christian morals the aspect of an arbitrary set of divine rules;[14] whilst it prepared the way for the unfortunate distinction between a higher kind of virtue for the monks, and a lower, which was sufficient for common Christians.[15]

It seems, at first sight, difficult to reconcile with this great external strictness, and yet is in fact intimately therewith connected, that we find in the church-fathers of this age principles concerning *veracity*, which undermine the very foundation of all true virtue.[16]

§ 101.

MORALS OF THE CLERGY.

As the offices in the church, no longer attended with danger and persecution, now brought only honor and power to their possessors, they were sought after with the greatest avidity,[1] and all the arts of

---

conjugali. e. g. c. 8: duo bona sunt connubium et continentia, quorum alterum est melius. Cap. 10: Certe dubitare fas non est, nuptias non esse peccatum. Non itaque nuptias secundum veniam concedit Apostolus (1 *Cor.* vii. 6).

[13] Against the use of meat and wine, *Hieronymus adv. Jovinian.* lib. II.

[14] Compare de Wette, l. c. S. 340.

[15] Münschers Dogmengesch. Bd. 4. S. 311 f. De Wette, l. c. S. 346 f.

[16] E. g. *Hieronymus Epist.* 30 (al. 50) *ad Pammachium:* Aliud esse γυμνα-στικῶς scribere, aliud δογματικῶς. In priori vagam esse disputationem, et adversario respondentem nunc hæc nunc illa proponere, argumentari ut libet, aliud loqui, aliud agere, panem, ut dicitur, ostendere, lapidem tenere. In sequenti autem aperta frons, et, ut ita dicam, ingenuitas necessaria est, etc. In particular they were disposed to allow far too great a latitude of accommodation (οἰκονομία), attributing it in the same extent to Jesus and the apostles. Compare *Suicer* s. v. συγκατάβασις T. II. p. 1067. Müncher's Dogmengesch. Bd. 4. S. 154. Jahn's Nachträge zu s. theol. Werken. Tübingen, 1821. In this way Jerome wished to explain the passage, *Gal.* ii. 11 seq., but was opposed by Augustine, whose principles were more strict (compare his writings *de mendacio* and *contra mendacium*). Compare the correspondence between them on this subject in *Epistt. Hieron.* Ep. 65, 67 – 73, 76. See Jahn, l. c. S. 31 ff. — *Chrysostom* too, *de sacerdotio* I. 5, lays down very questionable principles concerning the lawfulness of deception in certain cases: he was followed in this by his pupil *Johannes Cassianus,* coll. XVII. 8 seq., e. g. cap. 17: Itaque taliter de mendacio sentiendum, atque ita eo utendum est, quasi natura ei insit hellebori. Quodsi imminente exitiali morbo sumtum fuerit, fit salubre: cæterum absque summi discriminis necessitate perceptum præsentis exitii est. — Non enim Deus verborum tantum actuumque nostrorum discussor et judex, sed etiam propositi ac destinationis inspector est. Qui si aliquid causa salutis æternæ ac divinæ contemplationis intuitu ab unoquoque vel factum viderit vel promissum, tametsi hominibus durum atque iniquum esse videatur; ille tamen intimam cordis inspiciens pietatem, non verborum sonum, sed votum dijudicat voluntatis, quia finis operis et affectus considerandus est perpetrantis: quo potuerunt quidam, ut supra dictum est, etiam per mendacium justificari (e. g. Raab, *Jos.* 2), et alii per veritatis assertionem peccatum perpetuæ mortis incurrere (Delila, *Jud.* 16).

[1] Comp. § 89; and *Gregorius Naz.* in note 3, below.

flattery and intrigue put in requisition to obtain them.[2] In this way men were admitted amongst the clergy, not only destitute of the requisite qualifications for the sacred office, but of absolutely immoral character;* and a worldly spirit pervaded the whole order, which was manifested in the prostitution of the clerical character to the most selfish objects;[3] whilst at the same time the monkish spirit of the

---

[2] *Gregor. Naz. Orat.* XLIII. (al. XX.) *in laudem Basilii*, c. 26 (ed. *Colon.* p. 335): *νῦν δὲ κινδυνεύει τὸ πάντων ἀγιώτατον τάγμα τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν πάντων εἶναι καταγελαστότατον. οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἀρετῆς μᾶλλον, ἢ κακουργίας ἡ προεδρία· οὐδὲ τῶν ἀξιωτέρων, ἀλλὰ τῶν δυνατωτέρων οἱ θρόνοι.* Ullmanns Gregor. v. Naz. S. 511 ff.

* Compare *Hieron.* in ep. ad *Titum* (Opp. IV. p. 417).

[3] Compare *Hieronymus Ep.* 34 (al. 2) *ad Nepotianum*, concerning the law of Valentinian given above, § 89, note 11. He then continues: Ignominia omnium Sacerdotum est, propriis studere divitiis. Natus in paupere domo, et in tugurio rusticano, qui vix milio et cibario pane rugientem saturare ventrem poteram, nunc similam et mella fastidio. Novi et genera et nomina piscium, in quo littore concha lecta sit calleo: saporibus avium discerno provincias; et ciborum preciosorum me raritas, ac novissime damna ipsa delectant. Audio præterea in scnes et anus absque liberis quorumdam turpe servitium. Ipsi apponunt matulam, obsident lectum, purulentiam stomachi et phlegmata pulmonis, manu propria suscipiunt. Pavent ad introitum medici, trementibusque labiis, an commodius habeant, sciscitantur: et si paululum senex vegetior fuerit, periclitantur: simulataque lætitia, mens intrinsecus avara torquetur. He also described *Ep.* 18 (al. 22) *ad Eustochium*, the life of rich widows: Plena adulatoribus domus, plena conviviis. Clerici ipsi, quos in magisterio esse oportuerat doctrinæ pariter et timoris, osculantur capita matronarum, et extenta manu, ut benedicere eos putes velle, si nescias, pretia accipiunt salutandi. In an oration of that time, which is found amongst the sermons of *Ambrose (sermo in dominicam* XXII. *post Pentecosten)* and amongst those of *Augustine (ed. Benedict. Tom.* V. *App. Sermo* 82) we read, ad *Luc.* iii. 14: Si (clericus) non contentus stipendiis fuerit, quæ de altario, Domino jubente, consequitur: sed exercet mercimonia, *intercessiones vendit*, viduarum munera libenter amplectitur: hic negotiator magis potest videri, quam clericus. *Gregorii Naz. carmen de se ipso et adv. Episcopos*, v. 331 seq. (in *J. Tollii insignia Itineris Italici. Traj. ad Rhen.* 1696. 4to. p. 34 seq.):

331. *Ἄγνοια γὰρ κακὸν μὲν, ἀλλ' ἥσσον κακόν.*
Τί δ' ἄν τις εἴποι καὶ κακῶν μεμνημένος;
Εἰσὶν γὰρ, εἰσὶν ἀθλιώτεροί τινες,
Δύστην', ἀπευκτὰ τοῦ βίου κυβεύματα,
Τὴν πίστιν ἀμφιδίξιοι, καιρῶν νόμους,
Οὐ τοὺς θεοῦ σέβοντες, εὕρηποι λόγων
Παλιῤῥοοῦντες, ἢ κλάδων μετακλίσεις,
Θῶπες γυναικῶν, τερπνὰ δηλητήρια,
Μικροῖς λέοντες, τοῖς κρατοῦσι δ' αὖ κύνες,
Πάσης τραπέζης εὐφυεῖς ἰχνεύμονες
341. *Θύρας κρατούντων ἐκτρίβοντες, οὐ σοφῶν.* —
361. *Αἰσχρὸν μὲν εἰπεῖν, ὡς ἔχει, φράσω δ' ὅμως.*
Ταχθέντες εἶναι τοῦ καλοῦ διδάσκαλοι,
Κακῶν ἁπάντων ἐσμὲν ἐργαστήριον.
Σιγῇ βοῶντες, κἂν δοκῶμεν μὴ λέγειν·
Πρόεδρος ἡ κακία, πονείτω μηδὲ εἷς·
Κακὸν γένεσθαι, τοῦτο συντομώτατον,
367. *Καὶ λῶον·* — — — — — —
375. *Ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντας ῥᾳδίως καθίζομεν,*
Ἐὰν μόνον θέλωσι, λαοῦ προστάται,
Οὐδὲν σκοποῦντες τῶν νέων, ἢ τῶν πάλαι,
378. *Οὐ πράξιν, οὐ λόγον τιν', οὐ συνουσίαν.* —

age requiring from them great external strictness, all this corruption was accompanied by the most contemptible hypocrisy.[4] This moral —

382. Εἰ γὰρ τόδ' ἴσμεν, ὡς τὸν ἐξειλεγμένον
Χείρω τίθησιν ὡς τὰ πολλ' ἐξουσία,
384. Τίς ἂν προβάλοιτ' εὖ φρονῶν, ἓν ἀγνοεῖ; —
393. Ὁ δὲ πρόεδρος ῥαδίως εὑρίσκεται,
Μηδὲν πονηθεὶς, πρόσφατος τὴν ἀξίαν.
395. Ὦ τῆς ταχείας τῶν τρόπων μεταστροφῆς! —
402. Χθὲς ἦσθα μίμων καὶ θεάτρων ἐν μέσῳ,
(Τὰ δ' ἐκ θεάτρων ἄλλος ἐξεταξέτω)
Νῦν αὐτὸς ἡμῖν εἶ ξένη θεωρία.
Πρώην Φίλιππος, καὶ θεῷ τίμπων κόνιν,
406. Ὡς ἄλλος εὐχὰς, ἢ νοήματ' εὐσεβῆ. —
411. Νῦν εὐσταλής τις, καὶ βλέπων αἰδὼ μόνην,
412. Πλὴν εἰ λαθών που πρὸς ἀρχαῖον δράμοις. —
415. Χθὲς ῥητορεύων τὰς δίκας ἀπηκασόλεις,
416. Στρίφων ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω τὰ τῶν νόμων. —
419. Νῦν μοι δικαστὴς, καὶ Δανιήλ τις ἀθρόως.
Χθὲς μοι δικάζων σὺν ξίφει γυμνουμένῳ
Τὸ βῆμ' ἐποίεις ἔννομον ληστήριον,
Κλέπτων, πυραννῶν, καὶ πρὸ πάντων τοὺς νόμους.
Ὡς ἥμερός μοι σήμερον! οὐδ' ἐξθῆτά τις
Οὕτως ἀμείβει ῥᾳδίως, ὡς σὺ τρόπον.
Χθὲς ἐν χορευταῖς ἐστρέφου θηλυδρίαις,
Γάμων δὲ κήρυξ ἦσθα Λυδαῖς ἐν μέσαις,
Ὠδὰς λυγίζων, καὶ ποσοῖς γαυρούμενος.
Νῦν σωφρονιστὴς παρθένων καὶ συζύγων.
Ὥς σου τὸ καλὸν ὕποπτον ἐκ τοῦ πρὶν τρόπου!
Σίμων μάγος χθὲς, σήμερον Πέτρος Σίμων!
431. Φεῦ τοῦ τάχους! φεῦ, ἀντ' ἀλώπεκος λέων!

The remark is worthy attention, v. 382 seq. comp. v. 634 seq.

Οὕτοι μὲν οὕτως · καὶ τάχ' ἂν καὶ βελτίους
Αὐτῶν γενόμενοι κωλύονται τοῖς θρόνοις.
Τὸ γὰρ κρατεῖν τὸν ἄφρονα ποιεῖ χείρονα.

Gregorii Naz. Orat. II, (al. I.) *Apologeticus de fuga sua* (*ed. Col.* p. 4 seq.). ὅσοι μηδὲν τῶν πολλῶν ὄντες βελτίονες, μίγα μὲν οὖν εἰ καὶ μὴ πολλῷ χείρους, ἀνίπποις χερσὶν, ἅ δὴ λίγεται, καὶ ἀμυήτοις ψυχαῖς, τοῖς ἀγιωτάτοις ἑαυτοὺς ἐπεισάγουσι, καὶ σὺν ἄξιοι γενέσθαι προσιέναι τοῖς ἱεροῖς, μεταποιοῦνται τοῦ βήματος, θλίβονταί τε καὶ ὠθοῦνται περὶ τὴν ἀγίαν τράπεζαν, ὥσπερ οὐκ ἀρετῆς τύπον, ἀλλ' ἀφορμὴν βίου τὴν τάξιν ταύτην εἶναι νομίζοντες, οὐδὲ λειτουργίαν ὑπεύθυνον, ἀλλ' ἀρχὴν ἀνεξέταστον.

[4] Especially as Monachism led to the placing so great stress on externals, *Gregor. Naz. carmen de se ipso et adv. Episc.* v. 647 seq. describes a hypocritical priest.

647. Ἔπειτα χαλκὸς χρυσὸν ἠμφιεσμένος,
Ἢ καὶ χαμαιλέοντος ἔκστασις χρόας,
Πώγων, κατηφὲς ἦθος, αὐχένος κλάσις,
Φωνὴ βραχεῖα, πιστὸς ἐσκευασμένος,
651. Νωθρὸν βάδισμα, πάντα, πλὴν φρενὸς, σοφός.
696. Αἰσχρῶν μὲν οὖν αἴσχιστον ἡ τρόπου σλάσις.

Thus it became the custom, after the example of the monks (see *Bingham*, Lib. IV. c. 7, vol. II. p. 189 seq.), seemingly to decline ecclesiastic honors. cf. *Lex Leonis*, A. D. 469 (*Cod. Justin.* I. 3, 31): Nemo gradum sacerdotii pretii venalitate mercetur: — Cesset altaribus imminere profanus ardor avaritiæ, et a sacris adytis repellatur piaculare flagitium. — Nec pretio, sed precibus ordinetur antistes. Tantum ab ambitu debet esse sepositus, ut quæratur cogendus, rogatus recedat, invitatus effugiat: sola illi suffragetur necessitas excusandi. Profecto enim indig-

corruption of the clergy was much increased by the interference of the court in the affairs of the church. High as might be their spiritual pride,[5] they were for the most part ready enough to change their opinions at the pleasure of the emperors. The synods were the theatres for the exhibition of this modern Christian Pharisaism.[6]

§ 102.

MORAL INFLUENCE OF THE CHURCH ON THE PEOPLE AT LARGE.

This corrupt and imbecile clergy were called to the hardest task that perhaps ever was imposed on the teachers of the Christian religion. A highly cultivated, but deeply superstitious people, now crowded into the church, impelled for the most part by interested motives, and either still devoted to paganism in their hearts,[1] or else transferring the character of paganism to Christianity; and retaining

---

nus est sacerdotio, nisi fuerit ordinatus invitus. This priestly decorum led of course only to a mock reluctance and hesitation, cf. *Gregorius Naz. Orat.* XVII. *de se ipso.* p. 466: *οὐ γὰρ ἵνα ζητηθῶμεν ἀποκρυπτόμεθα· οὐδ' ἵνα πλείονος ἄξιοι δόξωμεν τιμῆς·*

[5] See above, § 90.

[6] Comp. the ironical discourse of *Greg. Naz.* at the 2d œcum. Council. (*Carmen de vita sua, Opp. ed. Colon.* T. II. p. 27:

— — — *ὃς θέλει δευρ' εἰσίτω,*
Κἂν δίστροφός τις ἢ πολύστροφος τύχῃ·
Πανήγυρις ἕστηκεν. ἀπίτω μηδεὶς
Ἀπραγμάτευτος. ἂν μεταστραφῇ κύβος
(Καιροῦ γὰρ οὐδέν ἐστιν εὐστροφώτερον),
Ἔχεις τὸ τεχνύδριον, ἔκδραμε πάλιν.
Οὐκ εὐμαθὲς πίστει τὸ προσκεῖσθαι μιᾷ,
Βίων δὲ πολλὰς εἰδέναι διεξόδους.

See *Carmen de se ipso et adv. Episc.* v. 152 (*Tollius* p. 18) concerning the same council.

— — — *καὶ γὰρ ἦν αἶσχος μέγα,*
Τούτων τιν' εἶναι τῶν κατήλων πίστεως.

So he calls the bishops (*Carmen de vita sua* p. 28) *Χριστέμποροι.* Being invited to the Synod of Constantinople, A. D. 382, he answered, *Epist.* 55 *ad Procopium:* *Ἔχω μὲν οὕτως, εἰ δεῖ τἀληθὲς γραφεῖν, ὥστε πάντα σύλλογον φεύγειν ἐπισκόπων, ὅτι μηδεμιᾶς συνόδου τέλος εἶδον χρηστόν, μηδὲ λύσιν κακῶν μᾶλλον ἰσχηκυίας, ἢ προσθήκην. Αἱ γὰρ φιλονεικίαι καὶ φιλαρχίαι (ἀλλ' ὅπως μήτε φορτικὸν ὑπολάβῃς οὕτω γράφοντα) καὶ λόγου κρείττονες· καὶ θᾶττον ἄν τις ἐγκληθείη κακίαν ἑτέραν δικάζων, ἢ τῶν ἐκείνων λύσειε. Διὰ τοῦτο εἰς ἐμαυτὸν συνεστάλην κ. τ. λ.* — *Carmen* X. v. 92 seq. (*Opp.* T. II. p. 81):

Οὐδέ τί που συνόδοισι ὁμόθρονος ἔσσομ' ἔγωγε
Χηνῶν ἢ γεράνων ἄκριτα μαρναμένων.
Ἔνθ' ἔοις, ἔνθα μόθος τε, καὶ αἶσχεα κρυπτὰ πάροιθεν
Εἰς ἕνα δυσμενέων χῶρον ἀγειρόμενα.

Comp. Ullmanns Gregor. v. Naz. S. 269 f.

[1] See § 73, note 4, and p. 182.

their heathen[2] or Jewish[3] practices. At the same time these new converts were demoralized by all the vices, which follow in the train of refinement, and confirmed in them by the example of the court, which had been growing more corrupt ever since its removal to the East.[4] Into this dead mass the life of Christianity was now to be infused, and Christian faith and Christian piety substituted in the place of superstition and vice. Such a work needed the purest and most spiritual doctrine, accompanied by more than apostolic zeal; but instead of these, those to whom the task fell depended chiefly on external means to accomplish it; on the one hand, giving to Christianity a character of compulsion which never belonged to it, and on the other, promoting a superstitious and external view of its character.

The bishops, almost without exception, gladly availed themselves of the now friendly spirit of the state to put down their enemies;[5]

---

[2] *P. E. Müller* comm. hist. de genio, moribus et luxu ævi Theodosiani (P. II. Lips. 1797, 98. 8vo. P. I. p. 33 seq. Neanders Chrysostomus Bd. 1. S. 236 ff. Use of holy things as charms, see above, § 97, note 32, 35, 41; § 99, note 13. Heineccius Abbildung der alten u. neuen griech. Kirche Leipzig 1711. 4to. Th. 3. S. 461. *Du Resnel* recherches historiques sur les sorts appelés communément par les Payens *sortes Homericæ, sortes Virgilianæ*, etc. et sur ceux qui parmi les Chrétiens ont été connus sous le nom de *sortes Sanctorum* in the *Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscriptions*, T. XIX. p. 287 seq.

[3] See especially *Chrysostomi adv. Judæos orat.* VIII. *Bingham*, vol. VII. p. 274 seq. Neanders Chrysostomus Bd. 1. S. 256 ff.

[4] Compare the description of the court at Julian's accession, *Ammian. Marcell.* XXII. 4: Namque fatendum est, pleramque eorum (Palatinorum) partem vitiorum omnium seminarium effusius aluisse, ita ut rempublicam inficerent cupiditatibus pravis, plusque exemplis quam peccandi licentia læderent multos. Pasti enim ex his quidam templorum spoliis, et lucra ex omni odorantes occasione, ab egestate infima ad saltum sublati divitiarum ingentium, nec largiendi, nec rapiendi, nec absumendi tenuere aliquem modum, aliena invadere semper adsuefacti. Unde fluxioris vitæ initia pullularunt, et perjuria, et nullus existimationis respectus, demensque superbia fidem suam probrosis quæstibus polluebat. Inter quæ ingluvies et gurgites crevere prærupti conviviorum, etc. An orator of the day (*Augustini*, Tom. V. App. *Sermo* 82, also in *Ambrosii Opp. Sermo* in dom. XXII. *post Pentecosten)* complaining: Usque adeo autem hoc inolevit malum, ut jam quasi ex consuetudine vendantur leges, corrumpantur jura, sententia ipsa venalis sit, et nulla jam causa possit esse sine causa.

[5] *Hilarii Pictav. contra Auxentium Mediol. Liber init.* Ac primum misereri licet nostræ ætatis laborem et præsentium temporum congemiscere: quibus patrocinari Deo humana creduntur, et ad tuendam Christi Ecclesiam ambitione sæculari laboratur. Oro vos, Episcopi, qui hoc vos esse creditis, quibusnam suffragiis ad prædicandum Evangelium Apostoli usi sunt? Quibus adjuti potestatibus Christum prædicaverunt, gentesque fere omnes ex idolis ad Deum transtulerunt? Anne aliquam sibi assumebant e palatio dignitatem, hymnum Deo in carcere, inter catenas, et post flagella cantantes? Edictisque Regis Paulus cum in theatro spectaculum ipse esset, Christo ecclesiam congregabat? — Aut non manifesta se tum Dei virtus contra odia humana porrexit: cum tanto magis Christus prædicaretur, quanto magis prædicari inhiberetur? At nunc, proh dolor! divinam fidem suffragia terrena commendant: inopsque virtutis suæ Christus, dum ambitio nomini suo conciliatur, arguitur. Terret exiliis et carceribus Ecclesia, credique sibi cogit, quæ exiliis et carceribus est credita: pendet a dignatione communicantium, quæ persequentium est consecrata terrore: fugat sacerdotes, quæ fugatis est sacerdotibus propagata: diligi sese gloriatur a mundo, quæ Christi esse non potuit, nisi eam mundus odisset. Hæc de comparatione traditæ nobis olim Ecclesiæ, nunc quam deperditæ, res ipsa, quæ in oculis omnium est atque ore, clamavit.

and thus the same violent measures were now used to advance the interests of the church, which the Christians had so vehemently deprecated when used to oppose them. It was not without the influence of the Christian clergy[6] that the laws against paganism were made more and more strict, and Judaism more and more narrowly circumscribed.[7] The treatment of heretics, too, became constantly more severe.[8] At first the church had been contented to counteract the evil influence of heresy by forbidding the meetings of heretics, or by an ecclesiastical reprimand;[9] and the execution of Priscillian had been universally regarded with abhorrence (vid. p. 215). But even Augustine had suffered himself to be persuaded of the fitness of corporeal punishment for outrageous heretics,[10] and Leo the Great defended the propriety of putting them to death.[11] At the same time

---

[6] See Chap. I. p. 178 et seq.

[7] *C. W. de Rhoer* dissertt. de effectu relig. Christianæ in jurisprudentiam Romanam, p. 157 seq.

[8] *Bingham*, vol. VII. p. 285 seq. *de Rhoer*, l. c. p. 170 seq.

[9] It is true that *Julian* accuses the Christians even in his time (*ap. Cyrill.* c. *Jul.* lib. VI. *ed. Spanh.* p. 206): ἀπεσφάξατε οὐχ ἡμῶν μόνον τοὺς τοῖς πατρῴοις ἐμμένοντας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἑξίσης ὑμῖν πεπλανημένων αἱρετικῶν τοὺς μὴ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ὑμῖν τὸν νεκρὸν θρηνοῦντας. *Epist.* 52, that under Constantine τοὺς πολλοὺς αὐτῶν καὶ φυγαδευθῆναι, καὶ διωχθῆναι, καὶ δεσμευθῆναι· πολλὰ δὲ ἤδη καὶ σφαγῆναι πλήθη τῶν λεγομένων αἱρετικῶν· ὡς ἐν Σαμοσάτοις, καὶ Κυζίκῳ, καὶ Παφλαγονίᾳ, καὶ Βιθυνίᾳ, καὶ Γαλατίᾳ, καὶ πολλοῖς ἄλλοις ἔθνεσιν ἄδην ἀναστραπῆναι πορθηθείσας κώμας. This is probably said, however, of extra-judicial murders.

[10] *Augustini* Ep. 93 (al. 48) *ad Vincentium*, § 17: mea primitus sententia non erat, nisi neminem ad unitatem Christi esse cogendum, verbo esse agendum, disputatione pugnandum, ratione vincendum, ne fictos catholicos haberemus, quos apertos hæreticos noveramus. Sed hæc opinio mea non contradicentium verbis, sed demonstrantium superabatur exemplis. Nam primo mihi opponebatur civitas mea, quæ cum tota esset in parte Donati, ad unitatem catholicam timore legum imperialium conversa est, quam nunc videmus ita hujus animositatis perniciem detestari, ut in ea nunquam fuisse credatur, etc. cf. *Epist.* 185 (al. 50) *ad Bonifacium, s. de correctione Donatistarum liber.* Still *Epist.* 100 (al. 127) *ad Donatum, Procons. Africæ:* unum solum est, quod in tua justitia pertimescimus, ne forte — pro immanitate facinorum, ac non potius pro lenitatis Christianæ consideratione censeas coërcendum, quod te per Jesum Christum ne facias obsecramus. — Ex occasione terribilium judicum ac legum ne in æterni judicii pœnas incidant, corrigi eos cupimus, non necari; nec disciplinam circa eos negligi volumus, nec suppliciis, quibus digni sunt, exerceri. So too *Epist.* 139 (al. 158) *ad Marcellinum:* Pæna sane illorum, quamvis de tantis sceleribus confessorum, rogo te, ut præter supplicium mortis sit, et propter conscientiam nostram, et propter catholicam mansuetudinem commendandam. cf. *Ph. a Limborch historia inquisitionis (Amst.* 1692. fol.) lib. I. c. 6. *J. Barbeyrac traité de la morale des pères*, c. 16. § 19. — *Jerome*, however, says, *Epist.* 37 (al. 53) *ad Riparium adv. Vigilantium:* Non est crudelitas pro Deo pietas. Unde et in lege dicit: si frater tuus et amicus et uxor, quæ est in sinu tuo, depravare te voluerit a veritate, sit manus tua super eos, et effunde sanguinem eorum, et auferes malum de medio Israel (*Deut.* xiii. 6 seq.). Chrysostom, on the other hand, like the older fathers (*Limborch*, l. c. cap. 5) condemns all persecution of heretics. Stäudlins Gesch. d. Sittenlehre Jesu Bd. 3. S. 238. de Wette Gesch. d. christl. Sittenlehre Erste Hälfte, S. 344.

[11] The first law of a Christian emperor, authorizing capital punishment for certain heresies, is that of Theodosius I. A. D. 382, against the Manichæans (*Cod. Theod.* XVI. 5, 9). *Sozomenus* VII. 12, says, however, of all the laws of this emperor: χαλεπὰς τοῖς νόμοις ἐπέγραφε τιμωρίας, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐπεξῄει· οὐ γὰρ τιμωρεῖσθαι, ἀλλ' εἰς

the bishops not only sought to prevent all intercourse between the true believers and the opponents of the church,[12] but even went so far as to release the orthodox from all social duties whatever towards heretics.[13]

No less erroneous were the means adopted by the clergy to attach converts to the worship of the Christian church. To this end they strove to give their ritual all the pomp of the heathen ceremonies, and thus only increased the tendency to a mere formal worship. On the one hand many were confirmed in the heathenish notion that such external rites were in themselves pleasing to God, and on the other there were not a few, especially in the cities, who went to the church as if it were to the theatre, and followed the favorite preachers of the day as they did the orators.[14] The occasions of public worship began now to be abused as opportunities for sensual excesses,[15] and the Agapæ, or love feasts, were on this account discontinued.[16]

Another hindrance to the right effect of Christianity upon the morals of the people is to be found in the *theological controversies* of the time. For whilst the clergy were contending about mere definitions, as if they constituted the very essence of Christianity, what wonder that with many the interest in religion should be merely an interest in sophistical speculations?[17] And then, again, as the prevailing sys-

---

δίος καθιστιᾷν τοὺς ὑπηκόους ἐσπουδάζεν (cf. *Socrates* V. 20): and *Socrates* VII. 3, maintains still: οὐκ εἰωθὼς διώκειν τῇ ὀρθοδόξῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ. On the other hand *Leo M. Epist.* 15 *ad Turribium*: — etiam mundi principes ita hanc sacrilegam amentiam (Priscillianistarum) detestati sunt, ut auctorem ejus cum plerisque discipulis legum publicarum ense prosternerent. — Profuit diu ista districtio ecclesiasticæ lenitati, quæ etsi sacerdotali contenta judicio, cruentas refugit ultiones, severis tamen Christianorum principum constitutionibus adjuvatur, dum ad spiritale nonnumquam recurrunt remedium, qui timent corporale supplicium.

[12] *Bingham*, vol. VII. p. 276 seq.; 294 seq.

[13] E. g. *Concil. Carthag.* III. ann. 397. can. 13: Ut Episcopi vel clerici, in eos qui catholici Christiani non sunt, etiamsi consanguinei fuerint, nec per donationes, nec per testamentum rerum suarum aliquid conferant.

[14] *Gregor. Naz. Orat.* 42 (*ed Colon. Or.* 22, p. 596): οὐ γὰρ ζητοῦσιν ἱερεῖς, ἀλλὰ ῥήτορας. The clergy themselves seem to have contributed to this, *Orat.* 36 (*ed. Col. Or.* 27, p 465): ὁρῶ πολλοὺς τῶν νῦν ἱερατεύειν ὑπισχνουμένων, οἱ τὴν ἀπλῆν καὶ ἄτεχνον ἡμῶν εὐσέβειαν ἔντεχνον πεποιήκασι, καὶ πολιτικῆς τι καινὸν εἶδος ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγορᾶς εἰς τὰ ἅγια μετενηνεγμένης, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν θεάτρων ἐπὶ τὴν τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀθέατον μυσταγωγίαν, ὡς εἶναι δύο σκηνὰς, εἰ δεῖ τολμήσαντα τοῦτο εἰπεῖν, τοσοῦτον ἀλλήλων διαφερούσας, ὅσον τὴν μὲν πᾶσιν ἀνεῖσθαι, τὴν δὲ τισί· καὶ τὴν μὲν γελᾶσθαι, τὴν δὲ τιμᾶσθαι· καὶ τὴν μὲν θεατρικὴν, τὴν δὲ πνευματικὴν ὀνομάζεσθαι. Comp. Neanders Chrysostomus Bd. I S. 118, 320 ff. 327. Ullmanns Gregor. v. Naz. S. 155 ff. Concerning the applause by clapping of hands during the sermon, see *B. Ferrarii de ritu sacrarum eccl. vet. concionum* (*Mediolani* 1621. *c. praef. J. G. Grævii. Ultraj.* 1692, 8vo.) lib. II. c. 24. *Bingham*, vol. VI. p. 187 seq.

[15] *Hieronymus adv. Vigilantium* (ed. *Martian.* T. IV. P. II. p. 285) says de vigiliis et pernoctationibus in basilicis Martyrum celebrandis in defence of them: Error autem et culpa juvenum vilissimarumque mulierum, qui per noctem sæpe deprehenditur, non est religiosis hominibus imputandus: quia et in vigiliis Paschæ tale quid fieri plerumque convincitur, et tamen paucorum culpa non præjudicat religioni, etc.

[16] See § 99, note 13.

[17] *Gregor. Naz. Orat.* XXXIII. p. 530: ὡς ἕν τι τῶν ἄλλων καὶ τοῦτο φλυαρεῖται ἡδέως, μετὰ τοὺς ἱππικοὺς, καὶ τὰ θέατρα, καὶ τὰ ἄσματα, καὶ τὴν γαστέρα, καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ

tem was often changed, and each alike supported and enforced by the power of the state, it was almost an unavoidable consequence that the people should either be made suspicious of Christianity and indifferent to it altogether, or else tempted to hypocrisy and falsehood in the holiest things.[18]

Monachism, it is true, seemed to offer this enervated race an example of the sacrifice of every thing to religion;[19] but the example was for the most part too imperfect to make any distinct impression, whilst by its arbitrary and irrational modes of serving God it only brought the moral notions of the time into greater confusion. In former times this external strictness had been responded to by an inward feeling, but now a still greater strictness was to be introduced amongst a generation destitute of all religious belief whatever. Of course every expedient was tried on the part of the people to lighten the burden thus laid upon them; and the monks themselves afforded them the means of so doing by making a distinction between a higher and lower virtue.[20] That the habits of society might in all respects be conformed to a Christian standard, the church now extended its penance to the most trivial offences,[21] and at the numerous synods an extensive code of laws was formed, fixing particular punishments for each particular transgression, according to certain specified circumstances. In the Eastern churches this penance was voluntary where the offence had been private; particularly after the office of a *presbyter for penance* (πρεσβύτερος ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας) (see § 68) was abolished;[22] but in the Western churches it began now to be con-

---

γαστέρα· οἷς καὶ τοῦτο μέρος τρυφῆς, ἡ περὶ ταῦτα ἐρεσχελία καὶ κομψεία τῶν ἀντιθέσεων. cf. *Orat.* XXI. p. 376. *Or.* XXVI. *Gregor. Nyss. Orat. de deitate fil. et spir. sancti Opp.* T. III. p. 466. See the law of Theodosius, A. D. 388 (*Cod. Theod.* XVI. 4, 2): Nulli egresso ad publicum vel disceptandi de religione, vel tractandi, vel consilii aliquid ferendi patescat occasio (c. f. *Gothofred.* ad h. l.), of Marcianus, A. D. 452 (in *Actis Conc. Chalced.* in *Mansi* VII. p. 476, and *Cod. Justin.* I. 1, 4), Neanders Chrysost. Bd. 2. S. 118. Ullmanns Gregor. v. Naz. S. 158 ff.

[18] *Gregorii Naz. carmen de se ipso et adv. Episcc.* v. 333 seq., see § 101, note 3.

[19] Neanders Chrysost. Bd. 1. S. 78, 90.

[20] Chrysostom inveighs vehemently against the abuses occasioned by this distinction, see Neanders Chrys. Bd. 1. S. 95 ff. Compare what is said by an anonymous preacher of the day (*Augustini*, Tom. V. *App. Sermo* 82, also contained in *Ambrosii Opp.* under the title *Sermo in dom.* XXII. *post Pentecost.*) on the text *Luc.* iii. 12 seq. Nonnulli fratres, qui aut militiæ cingulo detinentur, aut in actu sunt publico constituti, cum peccant graviter, hac solent a peccatis suis prima se voce excusare, quod militant. — Illud autem quale est, quod cum ob errorem aliquem a senioribus arguuntur, et imputatur alicui de illis, cur ebrius fuerit, cur res alienas pervaserit, cædem cur turbulentur admiscrit: statim respondeat: Quid habebam facere, homo sæcularis et miles? Numquid monachum sum professus aut clericum? Quasi omnis, qui clericus non est aut monachus, possit ei licere, quod non licet.

[21] Cramers Forts. v. Bossuets Weltgesch. Th. 5. B. 1. S. 379 ff.

[22] *Socrates* V. 19. *Sozomenus* VII. 16. According to Socrates the decree was: περιελεῖν μὲν τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας πρεσβύτερον· συγχωρῆσαι δὲ, ἕκαστον τῷ ἰδίῳ συνειδότι τῶν μυστηρίων μετέχειν.

sidered an indispensable condition of forgiveness for all gross sins, whether public or private,[23] though it was found expedient to substitute a private church penance for the public one, where the offence had been private.[24]

It cannot be denied that this system of penance had an effect to preserve a certain appearance of virtue; nor that the virtue of charity, which had been almost wholly neglected by the heathen, was kept alive by the example of the church, which never forgot the suffering, and carefully provided for the poor, and the prisoners, the sick, the widows and orphans;[25] but still by these endless laws Christian

---

[23] *Augustinus Serm.* 351 (*de Pœnitentia* 1), § 2 seq. distinguishes tres actiones pœnitentiæ. Una est, quæ novum hominem parturit, donec per baptismum salutare omnium præteritorum fiat ablutio peccatorum, — Altera, — cujus actio per totam istam vitam, qua in carne mortali degimus, perpetua supplicationis humilitate subeunda est. — Tertia, quæ pro illis peccatis subeunda est, quæ legis decalogus continet. Of this last, § 9: Implicatus igitur tam mortiferorum vinculis peccatorum detrectat, aut differt, aut dubitat confugere ad ipsas claves Ecclesiæ, quibus solvatur in terra, ut sit solutus in cœlo; et audet sibi post hanc vitam, quia tantum Christianus dicitur, salutem aliquam polliceri? — Judicet ergo se ipsum homo — et mores convertat in melius. — Et cum ipse in se protulerit severissimæ medicinæ, sed tamen medicinæ sententiam, veniat ad antistites, per quos illi in Ecclesia claves ministrantur: et tamquam bonus jam incipiens esse filius, maternorum membrorum ordine custodito, a præpositis sacramentorum accipiat satisfactionis suæ modum. — Ut si peccatum ejus non solum in gravi ejus malo, sed etiam in tanto scandalo aliorum est, atque hoc expedire utilitati Ecclesiæ videtur antistiti, in notitia multorum, vel etiam totius plebis agere pœnitentiam non recuset, non resistat, non letali et mortiferæ plagæ per pudorem addat tumorem. *Leo M. Epist.* 108, *ed. Ball.* (83 *ed. Quesn.*) *ad Theodorum*, c. 2: Multiplex misericordia Dei ita lapsibus subvenit humanis, ut non solum per baptismi gratiam, sed etiam per pœnitentiæ medicinam spes vitæ reparetur æternæ, ut qui regenerationis dona violassent, proprio se judicio condemnantes, ad remissionem criminum pervenirent: sic divinæ bonitatis præsidiis ordinatis, ut indulgentia Dei nisi supplicationibus Sacerdotum nequeat obtineri. Mediator enim Dei et hominum homo Christus Jesus hanc præpositis Ecclesiæ tradidit potestatem, ut et confitentibus actionem pœnitentiæ darent; et eosdem salubri satisfactione purgatos ad communionem sacramentorum per januam reconciliationis admitterent. Cui utique operi incessabiliter ipse Salvator intervenit, nec umquam ab his abest, quæ ministris suis exequenda commisit, dicens: *Ecce ego vobiscum sum, etc.* (*Matth.* xxviii. 20) ut si quid per servitutem nostram bono ordine et gratulando impletur effectu, non ambigamus per Spiritum sanctum fuisse donatum. cf. *Hieronymus comm. in Matth.* xvi. 19: Istum locum: *Et dabo tibi claves regni cælorum*, Episcopi et Presbyteri non intelligentes, aliquid sibi de Pharisæorum assumunt supercilio, ut vel damnent innocentes, vel solvere se noxios arbitrentur, quum apud Deum non sententia sacerdotum, sed reorum vita quæratur.

[24] *Leo M. Epist.* 168, *ed. Ball.* (*ed. Quesn.* 136) c. 2: Illam etiam contra apostolicam regulam præsumtionem, quam nuper agnovi a quibusdam illicita usurpatione committi, modis omnibus constituo submoveri. De pœnitentia scilicet, quæ a fidelibus postulatur, ne de singulorum peccatorum genere, libello scripta professio publice recitetur: cum reatus conscientiarum sufficiat solis sacerdotibus indicari confessione secreta. — Quia non omnium hujusmodi sunt peccata, ut ea, qui pœnitentiam poscunt, non timeant publicare; removeatur tam improbabilis consuetudo: ne multi a pœnitentiæ remediis arceantur, dum aut erubescunt, aut metuunt inimicis suis sua facta reserari, quibus possint legum constitutione percelli. Sufficit enim illa confessio, quæ primum Deo offertur, tum etiam Sacerdoti, qui pro delictis pœnitentium precator accedit. Tunc enim demum plures ad pœnitentiam poterunt provocari, si populi auribus non publicetur conscientia confitentis.

[25] *Thomassinus*, P. II. Lib. 3. c. 87, and c. 95 seq. Stäudlins Gesch. d. Sittenlehre Jesu Bd. 3. S. 404 ff.

freedom was crushed, and so the root of all true Christian morals destroyed, as may at once be seen by a comparison of this with former periods of the church.[26]

§ 103.

INFLUENCE OF THE CHURCH ON LEGISLATION.

C. W. de Rhœr dissert. de effectu religionis christianæ in jurisprudentiam Romanam. Fasc. I. Groningæ. 1776. 8vo.

Though it would be wrong to ascribe to Christianity exclusively the great changes which had taken place in the Roman law since the time of Constantine,[1] we can yet clearly trace here the influence of Christian morals, and even some reference to the Mosaic institutions;[2] whilst some of the new laws were adopted expressly at the instance of the bishops.[3]

Theatrical representations were abolished, at least much circumscribed;[4] and the contests of gladiators, which had hitherto been continued at Rome notwithstanding Constantine's prohibition, were at length entirely done away with by Honorius.[5] Classes of society, which heretofore had hardly been recognised by the laws, were now provided for. The condition of slaves[6] and of prisoners[7] was im-

---

[26] e. g. *Chrysostomus Hom.* 26 *in Epist.* II. *ad Corinth.* ἂν τὰ ἡμέτερά τις ἐξετάσῃ τὰ νῦν, ὄψεται ἡλίκον τῆς θλίψεως τὸ κέρδος. νῦν μὲν γὰρ εἰρήνης ἀπολαύοντες ἀναπεπτώκαμεν, καὶ διεῤῥύημεν, καὶ μυρίων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐνεπλήσαμεν κακῶν· ὅτε δὲ ἠλαυνόμεθα, καὶ σωφρονέστεροι, καὶ ἐπιεικέστεροι, καὶ σπουδαιότεροι, καὶ περὶ τοὺς συλλόγους τούτους ἦμεν προθυμότεροι, καὶ περὶ τὴν ἀκρόασιν· ὅπερ γὰρ τῷ χρυσίῳ τὸ πῦρ, τοῦτο ἡ θλίψις ταῖς ψυχαῖς κ. τ. λ. *Hieronymus in vita Malchi init.* Scribere disposui, — ab adventu Salvatoris usque ad nostram ætatem, — quomodo et per quos Christi Ecclesia nata sit, et adulta, persecutionibus creverit, et martyriis coronata sit: et postquam ad Christianos principes venerit, potentia quidem et divitiis major, sed virtutibus minor facta sit. Verum hæc alias. *Salvianus de avaritia* I. 1, cf. *Rittershusius Sacr. Lectt.* VI. c. 17. *Venema hist. eccl.* T. IV. p. 260 seq.

[1] See *de Rhœr*, p. 39 seq.

[2] See *de Rhœr*, p. 65, 77 seq.

[3] See *de Rhœr*, p. 89 seq. — As to the influence of Christianity on the laws of Constantine (νόμους ἐκ παλαιῶν ἐπὶ τὸ ὁσιώτερον μεταβάλλων ἀνενεοῦτο) compare *Euseb. de vita Const.* IV. 26.

[4] Compare the laws, *Cod. Theodos.* Lib. XV. Tit. 5 *de Spectaculis;* Tit. 6 *de Majuma;* Tit. 7 *de Scenicis.* Stäudlins Gesch. d. Sittenlehre Jesu B. 3. S. 388.

[5] *Cod. Theod.* Lib. XV. Tit. 12 *de Gladiatoribus.* Compare the Self-sacrifice of Telemachus, *Theodoret. hist. eccl.* V. 26. Compare Neanders Chrysost. B. 1. S. 383.

[6] See *de Rhœr*, p. 117 seq.

[7] See *de Rhœr*, p. 72.

proved; the power of fathers over their children in some degree limited,[8] women invested with new rights,[9] and the widow and the orphan protected.[10] The ascetic tendency of the time also could be here and there traced in the laws, though its influence was not so great as might be expected. The laws against celibacy were abolished,[11] and second marriages allowed only under certain restrictions.[12] The general character of the laws became more secure.[13] It was several times attempted to make adultery the only ground of divorce; but these attempts were quickly abandoned, on account of the crimes to which they led.[14]

CHAPTER SEVENTH.

REFORMERS.

§ 104.

The changes in the customs of the church could not be unperceived, especially as it is certain that the orthodox were often reproached with them by the older Christian sects.[1] Nor was the

---

[8] See *de Rhœr*, p. 137 seq.

[9] See *de Rhœr*, p. 124.

[10] See *de Rhœr*, p. 111.

[11] *Cod. Theod.* VIII. 15, 1. See § 55, note 31.

[12] Concerning the so-called pœnas secundarum nuptiarum, see *de Rhœr*, p. 240.

[13] See *de Rhœr*, p. 59 seq.

[14] *Cod. Theodos.* Lib. III. *Tit.* 16 *de Repudiis. Theodosii* II. *Novell. Tit.* 17 (in Hugo's ed. *Tit.* 12). *Valentini* III. *Novell. Tit.* 12 (Hugo *Tit.* 35). *Bingham*, vol. IX. p. 356 seq. *de Rhœr* p. 287 seq. *Asterii Amaseni* (about 400) *homil.* V. (in *Combefisii Auct. nov.* T. I. p. 82): ἀκούσατε δὲ νῦν οἱ τούτων κάπηλοι, καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας ὡς ἱμάτια εὐκόλως μετενδυόμενοι· οἱ τὰς πασπάλας πολλάκις καὶ ῥᾳδίως πηγνύντες, ὡς πανηγύρεως ἐργαστήρια. — Οἱ μικρὸν παροξυνόμενοι καὶ εὐθὺς τὸ βιβλίον τῆς διαιρέσεως γράφοντες· οἱ πολλὰς χήρας ἐν τῷ ζῆν ἔτι καταλιμπάνοντες· πείσθητε, ὅτι γάμος θανάτῳ μόνῳ καὶ μοιχείᾳ διακόπτεται. *Hieronymi Epist.* 84 (*al.* 30) *ad Oceanum de morte Fabiolæ* c. 1: Aliæ sunt leges Cæsarum, aliæ Christi: aliud Papinianus, aliud Paulus noster præcipit, etc.

[1] *Faustus* (ap. Augustin. contra Faust. XX. 4): Vos, qui desciscentes a gentibus monarchiæ opinionem primo vobiscum divulsistis, id est, ut omnia credatis ex Deo: sacrificia vero eorum vertistis in agapes, idola in Martyres, quos votis similibus colitis: defunctorum umbras vino placatis et dapibus: solemnes gentium dies cum ipsis celebratis, ut calendas, et solstitia: de vita certe mutastis nihil: estis sane schisma, a matrice sua diversum nihil habens nisi conventum. The Novatians also rejected the worship of martyrs and reliques, see *Eulogius Patr. Alex.* (about A. D. 580) *contra Novatianos lib. Vto.* (by *Photius cod.* 280. cf. *cod.* 182): perhaps also Eustathius (*Conc. Gangr.* c. 20, compare, however, *Dallæus adv. Latinorum de cultus religiosi objecto tradit.* p. 151). Eunomius opposed the worship of martyrs (auctor hujus hæreseos. *Hieron. adv. Vigilant.*) and Monachism (Gregor. Nyssen. contra Eunom. lib. II.).

dangerous moral tendency of many of these new customs overlooked, probably, by the more reflecting, though too often excused for the sake of the pious motives from which they had sprung.[2] The few who looked more deeply into the ecclesiastical and religious errors of the time, and ventured to attack them, were at once declared heretics by the offended hierarchy; and thus the ineffectual voice of remonstrance soon died away. Such were *Aerius*, presbyter of Sebaste, and the friend of the bishop Eustathius (about the year 360);[3] *Jovinian*, a Roman monk (about the year 388), first condemned by Siricius at Rome, and then by Ambrose at Milan;[4] some of whose

---

[2] *Augustin. ad Januarium*, lib. II: (Epist. 55) § 35: Quod autem instituitur præter consuetudinem, ut quasi observatio sacramenti sit, approbare non possum, etiamsi *multa hujusmodi propter nonnullaram vel sanctarum vel turbulentarum personarum scandala devitanda, liberius improbare non audeo.* Sed hoc nimis doleo, quod multa, quæ in divinis libris saluberrime præcepta sunt, minus curantur; et tam multis præsumtionibus sic plena sunt omnia, ut gravius corripiatur, qui per octavas suas terram nudo pede tetigerit (namely, *neophytus* cf. *Tert. de cor. mil.* c. 3, see § 52, note 21), quam qui mentem vinolentia sepelieret. Omnia itaque talia, quæ neque sanctarum scripturarum auctoritatibus continentur, nec in conciliis episcoporum statuta inveniuntur, nec consuetudine universæ ecclesiæ roborata sunt, sed pro diversorum locorum diversis moribus innumerabiliter variantur, ita ut vix aut omnino nunquam inveniri possint causæ, quas in eis instituendis homines secuti sunt ubi facultas tribuitur, sine ulla dubitatione resecanda existimo. Quamvis enim neque hoc inveniri possit, quomodo contra fidem sint: ipsam tamen *religionem, quam paucissimis et manifestissimis celebrationum sacramentis misericordia Dei esse liberam voluit, servilibus oneribus premunt*, ut tolerabilior sit conditio Judæorum, qui etiamsi tempus libertatis non agnoverunt, legalibus tamen sarcinis, non humanis præsumtionibus subjiciuntur. Sed ecclesia Dei inter multam paleam multaque zizania constituta, multa tolerat, et tamen quæ sunt contra fidem vel bonam vitam non approbat, nec tacet nec facit. *Id. contra Faustum* XX. 21: Aliud est quod docemus, aliud quod sustinemus, aliud quod præcipere jubemur, aliud quod emendare præcipimur, et donec emendemus, tolerare compellimur. Alia est disciplina Christianorum, alia luxuria vinolentorum, vel error infirmorum.

[3] Only authority *Epiphan.* hær. 75. His doctrines ib. § 3: I. *τί ἐστιν ἐπίσκοπος πρὸς πρεσβύτερον; οὐδὲν διαλλάττει οὗτος τούτου· μία γάρ ἐστι τάξις, καὶ μία τιμὴ καὶ ἓν ἀξίωμα* (Proofs from passages in the N. T. § 5). II. *τί ἐστι τὸ πάσχα, ὅπερ παρ' ὑμῖν ἐπιτελεῖται; — οὐ χρὴ τὸ πάσχα ἐπιτέλειν· τὸ γὰρ πάσχα ὑμῶν ἐτύθη Χριστός* (1 Cor. v. 7). — III. *τίνι τῷ λόγῳ μετὰ θάνατον ὀνομάζετε ὀνόματα τεθνεώτων; — εἰ δὲ ὅλως εὐχὴ τῶν ἐνταῦθα τοὺς ἐκεῖσε ὤνησειν, ἄρα γοῦν μηδεὶς εὐσεβείτω, μηδὲ ἀγαθοποιείτω, ἀλλὰ κτησάσθω φίλους τινὰς, — καὶ εὐχίσθωσαν περὶ αὐτοῦ, ἵνα μή τι ἐκεῖ πάθῃ.* — IV. *οὔτε νηστεία ἔσται τεταγμένη· ταῦτα γὰρ Ἰουδαϊκά ἐστι, καὶ ὑπὸ ζυγὸν δουλείας. — εἰ γὰρ ὅλως βούλομαι νηστεύειν, οἵαν δ' ἂν αἱρήσομαι ἡμέραν ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ νηστεύω διὰ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν.* The heresy of Aerius was often charged upon the Protestants. Walchs Ketzerhist. Th. 3, S. 321 ff.

[4] *Siricii* epist. ad diversos episcopos adv. Jovinianum (about A. D. 389) Coustant Epist. 7. *Ambrosii* rescriptum ad Siricium (Epist. 42. Coustant Ep. Siric. 8). *Hieronimi* libb. II. adv. Jovinianum, A. D. 392. *Augustinus* de hæres. c. 82, and scattered in other writings of his. Compare Walch, l. c. S. 635 ff. His doctrines, *Hieron.* I. 2: Dicit, virgines, viduas et maritatas, quæ semel in Christo lotæ sunt, si non discrepent cæteris operibus, ejusdem esse meriti (*August.* l. c. virginitatem etiam sanctimonialium, et continentiam sexus virilis in sanctis eligentibus cælibem vitam, conjugiorum castorum atque fidelium meritis adæquabat: ita ut quædam virgines sacræ provectæ jam ætatis in urbe Roma, ubi hæc docebat, eo audito nupsisse dicantur). Nititur approbare, eos, qui plena fide in baptismate renati sunt, a diabolo non posse subverti (afterwards: — non posse tentari: quicunque autem tentati fuerint, ostendi, eos aqua tantum, et non spiritu baptizatos, quod in Simone mago leginus). Tertium proponit, inter abstinentiam ciborum,

opinions were soon after revived by two monks of Milan, *Sarmatio* and *Barbatianus* (about A. D. 396);[5] and especially *Vigilantius* (about the year 404), presbyter of Barcelona.[6]

---

et cum gratiarum actione perceptionem eorum, nullam esse distantiam. Quartum, quod et extremum, esse omnium, qui suum baptisma servaverint, unam in regno cœlorum remunerationem. To which Augustine adds, l. c.: Omnia peccata, sicut stoici philosophi, paria esse dicebat and virginitatem Mariæ destruebat, dicens eam pariendo fuisse corruptam. — Compare *Augustin.* retract. II. 22: Remanserant autem istæ disputationes ejus (Joviniani) in quorundam sermunculis ac susurris, quas palam suadere nullus audebat: — jactabatur, Joviniano responderi non potuisse cum laude, sed cum vituperatione nuptiarum (cf. § 100, note 12). Propter hoc librum edidi, cujus inscriptio est *De bono conjugali.*

[5] *Ambrosii* epist. 63 (al. 82, al. 25) ad Vercellensem ecclesiam: Audio venisse ad vos Sarmationem et Barbatianum, vaniloquos homines, qui dicunt nullum esse abstinentiæ meritum, nullum frugalitatis, nullam virginitatis gratiam, pari omnes æstimari pretio, delirare eos, qui jejuniis castigent carnem suam, ut menti subditam faciant, etc.

[6] Concerning his former residence in Palestine (A. D. 396), and his controversy with Jerome, whom he considered a follower of Origen, see *Hieron. Ep. ad Vigilantium (Martian. Ep.* 36. *Vallarsi Ep.* 61). — Against the later assertions of Vigilantius, *Hieron. Ep. ad Riparium*, A. D. 404 (in *Martian. Ep.* 37, in *Vallarsi Ep.* 109) *adv. Vigilantium*, lib. A. D. 406. — In this last we have: Martyrum negat sepulchra veneranda (in *Ep. ad Riparium:* Ais, Vigilantium, qui κατ' ἀντίφρασιν hoc vocatur nomine, nam Dormitantius rectius diceretur, os fœtidum rursus aperire, et putorem spurcissimum contra sanctorum martyrum proferre reliquias: et nos, qui eas suspicimus, appellare cinerarios et idololatras, qui mortuorum hominum ossa veneremur), damnandas dicit esse vigilias, nunquam nisi in pascha alleluja cantandum (cf. *Bingham*, vol. VI. p. 41 seq.) continentiam hæresin, pudicitiam libidinis seminarium. — Proh nefas, episcopos sui sceleris dicitur habere consortes, si tamen episcopi nominandi sunt, qui non ordinant diaconos, nisi prius uxores duxerint, nulli cælibi credentes pudicitiam. Extracts from the writings of Vigilantius: Quod necesse est, te tanto honore non solum honorare, sed etiam adorare illud nescio quid, quod in modico vasculo transferendo colis? — Quid pulverem linteamine circumdatum adorando oscularis? — Prope ritum gentilium videmus sub prætextu religionis introductum in ecclesiis, sole adhuc fulgente moles cereorum accendi, et ubicunque pulvisculum nescio quod in modico vasculo pretioso linteamine circumdatum osculantes adorant. Magnum honorem præbent hujusmodi homines beatissimis martyribus, quos putant de vilissimis cereolis illustrandos, quos agnus, qui est in medio throni cum omni fulgore majestatis suæ illustrat. — Vel in sinu Abrahæ, vel in loco refrigerii, vel subter aram Dei animæ Apostolorum et Martyrum consederunt, nec possunt suis tumulis et ubi voluerint, adesse præsentes. — Dum vivimus, mutuo pro nobis orare possumus: postquam autem mortui fuerimus, nullius est pro alio exaudienda oratio. Jerome adds still farther: Præterea iisdem ad me relatum est epistolis, quod contra auctoritatem Pauli — tu prohibeas, Hierosolymam in usus sanctorum aliqua sumtuum solatia dirigi: — hoc unumquemque posse in patria sua facere: nec pauperes defuturos, qui ecclesiæ opibus sustentandi sint. — Asseris, eos melius facere, qui utuntur rebus suis, et paulatim fructus possessionum suarum pauperibus dividunt, quam illos, qui possessionibus venumdatis — semel omnia largiuntur. — Dicis: si omnes se clauserint et fuerint in solitudine: quis celebrabit ecclesias? quis sæculares homines lucrifaciet? quis peccantes ad virtutes poterit cohortari? Compare the works cited § 100, note 1, *Barbeyrac préf.* p. 48. *Ceillier*, p. 339 seq. *Barbeyrac traité*, p. 251 seq. — *Bayle diction. s. v. Vigilantius. Walch de Vigilantio hæretico orthodoxo. Goett.* 1756. (in *Pottii syll. comm. theol.* vol. VIII. p. 326.) Walchs Ketzerh. Th. 3. S. 673 ff.

CHAPTER EIGHTH.

SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

§ 105.

IN THE EAST.

In PERSIA, where there were numerous churches under the metropolitan bishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, Christianity had become an object of suspicion ever since it was adopted as the religion of the Roman empire. The recommendation of Constantine, therefore, was not likely to have any lasting influence with the Persian king (Schabur II. A. D. 309 – 381).[1] Nor was it long before the war between the Romans and Persians led to an obstinate and bloody persecution of the Persian Christians, beginning with the execution of Simon, bishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon (A. D. 343), under pretext of his being a spy of the Romans.[2] After Schabur's death this persecution ceased, and his successor, Jetzdedgerd I. (A. D. 400 – 421), was at first friendly to the Christians. But the fanatic Abdas, bishop of Susa, brought on another persecution by his imprudence, which proved as disastrous as the other; till Theodosius II. at last put an end to it by making war on the Persians in the year 422.[3] In later times the persecuted Nestorians were received with especial favor in Persia.[4]

In ARMENIA Christianity had been introduced as early as the 2d century,[5] but first became general under Constantine, chiefly through the influence of Gregory, surnamed *Illuminator*, by whom king Tiridates was converted.[6] In the 5th century an alphabet and a translation of the Bible was introduced by Miesrob.[7] From Armenia Christianity was carried into IBERIA as early as the time of Constantine the Great.[8]

---

[1] Constantini epist. ad regem Persarum ap. *Euseb. de vit. Const.* IV. 9 – 13 et ap. *Theodoret.* I. 24.

[2] *Sozomen.* II. 9 – 14. — *Steph. Evod. Assemani Acta sanctorum Martyrum orientalium et occidentalium. Romæ*, 1748. fol.

[3] *Theodoretus* V. 38, *Socrates* VII. 18 – 21.

[4] See § 86.

[5] Dionysius Corinthius, according to Euseb. VI. 46, wrote *τοῖς κατὰ Ἀρμενίαν περὶ μετανοίας, ὧν ἐπισκόπευε Μεροῦζάνης.*

[6] Sozomenus II. 8, *Mosis Chorenensis historiæ Armeniacæ libb.* III. *ed. Guilelmus et Georgius Guil. Whistoni filii* Londini 1736. 4to. p. 256 seq. Mémoires hist. et geogr. sur l'Armenie, par M. I. St. Martin. Paris. 1818. 8vo.

[7] Hugs Einl. in das N. Test. (3te Aufl. 1826) Th. 1. S. 398 ff.

[8] *Rufini* hist. eccl. X. 10. *Socrates* I. 20. *Sozomenus* II. 7. *Theodoretus* I. 23.

Nearly at the same time it was introduced into Ethiopia by Frumentius; first at court, whence it soon spread throughout that region.[9]

Constantine endeavoured to diffuse the Christian doctrines in the South of Arabia also, by the means of Theophilus (about the year 350),[10] but, as it would seem, without much effect.

§ 106.

IN THE WEST.

In the first period we have seen that Christianity was already introduced amongst the Goths (§ 56), and we find traces of a Gothic bishop present at the council of Nice.[1] When the Visigoths were driven by the Huns to ask a new place of residence of Valens, he allowed them to go into Thrace on condition of their becoming Christians (A. D. 375).[2] Their actual conversion is chiefly to be attributed to their bishop Ulfilas, to whom they were indebted also for an alphabet and a translation of the Bible.[3]

Valens introduced of course his own peculiar views amongst the Visigoths, and from them Arianism was spreading with amazing rapidity amongst all the other German nations, at the same time that at Rome it was rejected and persecuted.[4] It was not so much from preference of the doctrines as from hatred of the Romans that Arianism was thus generally adopted by the Germans; but from whatever cause, it seemed likely to become as general amongst them as the opposite opinions amongst their enemies.

It was first received by the Ostrogoths and the Vandals. Thus the Burgundians, though at first they had belonged to the Catholic church, adopted the Arian doctrine with their Arian kings (about the year 450). So too the Sueci in Spain, having been conquered

---

[9] *Rufinus* X. 9. *Socrates* I. 19. *Sozomenus* II. 24. *Theodoretus* I. 22. *Hiobi Ludolfi historiæ Æthiopicæ libb.* IV. *Francof.* 1681. fol. lib. III. c. 2. *Ejusdem commentarius ad hist. Æthiopicam ibid.* 1691. fol. p. 283 seq.

[10] *Philostorgius* II. 6, III. 4. As it was Arianism thus introduced, the orthodox historians are silent on the subject.

[1] Amongst the Latin signatures: *Theophilus Gothorum Metropolis* (sc. Episc.) *Socrates*, also, II. 41, mentions this signature.

[2] *Socrates* IV. 33, 34. *Sozomenus* VI. 37. *Theodoretus* IV. 33. *Jornandes* (bishop of Ravenna, about A. D. 550) de rebus Geticis (in *Muratori* rerum Italicarum scriptor. T. I. p. 187) c. 25.

[3] Ulfilas Gothische Bibelübersetzung — ed. by J. Chr. Zahn. Weissenfels, 1805. 4to. Ulphilæ partium ineditarum in Ambrosianis palimpsestis ab Angelo Majo repertarum specimen conjunctis curis ejusdem *Maji* et *C. Oct. Castilionæi* editum Mediolani 1819. 4to. Hugs Einleit. in das N. T. Th. 1. S. 492 ff.

[4] Walchs Ketzerhistorie Th. 2. S. 553–569. cf. *Prosper in Chron. ex edit. Pithœi ad ann.* 10, *Arcadii et Honorii (Bibl. Max. PP.* VIII. p. 201): Radagaius Rex Gothorum Italiæ limitem vastaturus transgreditur. Ex hoc Arriani, qui Romano procul orbe fugati, barbararum nationum, ad quas se contulere, præsidio erigi cœpere.

by the Visigoths, changed from the views which had first been inculcated amongst them (see p. 263) to Arianism.[5] The original inhabitants of the countries where these German nations had fixed themselves, though faithful to the doctrine of the church of Rome, were seldom molested in their faith; excepting in Africa (A. D. 431–439), where the victorious Vandals under their two first kings Geiserich († A. D. 477) and Hunerich († A. D. 484) persecuted the orthodox Christians with the utmost cruelty.[6] What rude notions the Germans entertained of Christianity may be seen in the practice of buying off crimes with money, which they transferred to their new religion.[7]

In Britain (see § 56) Christianity was confined to a limited extent of country since the incursions of the Anglo-Saxons (A. D. 449); the Britons (who alone were Christians) being shut up in Wales, and in the mountains of Northumberland and Cornwall.

Shortly before this (about the year 430) Christianity had been introduced into Ireland by Patricius, a Scotchman, and soon spread over the whole island.[8] The seat of the bishop was established at Armagh.

---

[5] *Jornandes* c. 25: Sic quoque Vesegothæ a Valente Imp. Ariani potius quam Christiani effecti. De cætero tam Ostrogothis quam Gepidis parentibus suis per affectionis gratiam evangelizantes hujus perfidiæ culturam edocentes, omnem ubique linguæ hujus nationem ad culturam hujus sectæ invitavere.

[6] *Victor* Episc. Vitensis wrote A. D. 487 historia persecutionis Africanæ sub Genserico et Hunnerico Vandalorum regibus reprinted in *Th. Ruinarti* historia persecutionis Vandalicæ. Paris. 1694. 8vo. (Venet. 1732. 4to.) Neanders Denkwürdigkeiten Bd. 3. Heft. 1. S. 3 ff.

[7] *cf. Homilia de hæreticis peccata vendentibus in Mabillon Museum Italicum* T. I. P. II. p. 27 (according to Mabillon's conjecture, p. 6, written by Maximus Taurinensis, about A. D. 440): Nec mirari debemus, quod hujusmodi hæretici in nostra aberrare cœperint regione. — Nam ut eorum interim blasphemias seponamus, retexamus, quæ sint ipsorum præcepta vivendi. Præpositi eorum, quos Presbyteros vocant, dicuntur tale habere mandatum, ut si quis laicorum fassus fuerit crimen admissum, non dicat illi: *age pœnitentiam, deplora facta tua, defle peccata;* sed dicat: *pro hoc crimine da tantum mihi, et indulgetur tibi.* — Suscipit ergo dona Presbyter, et pactione quadam indulgentiam de salvatore promittit. Insipiens placitum, in quo dicitur, minus deliquisse Domino, qui plus contulerit Sacerdoti. Apud hujusmodi præceptores semper divites innocentes, semper pauperes criminosi.

[8] For the history of Patricius, see esp. his *Confessio* (in *Patricii opusculis ed. Jac. Waræus. Lond.* 1658. 8vo. and *Acta SS. Mart.* T. II. p. 517 ad Mar. 15). His biographer, *Jocelinus*, on the other hand (in the 12th century), has introduced various fables. For instance, he makes him travel to Rome, and there receive a commission from Pope Cælestinus. See *Jac. Usserii britannicarum ecclesiarum antiquitates. Dublin.* 1639. 4to. *auctius Lond.* 1687. fol. Neander's Denkwürdigkeiten, Bd. 3. Heft. 2. S. 19 ff. Irish Antiquarian Researches by Sir William Betham, P. II. Dublin. 1826 and 27, 8vo.

SECOND DIVISION.

FROM THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON TO THE BEGINNING OF THE MONOTHELETIC CONTROVERSIES, AND THE TIME OF MUHAMMED.

A. D. 451 — 622.

SOURCES.

1. Ecclesiastical historians: The works of *Basil* of Cicilia (Presb. in Antioch, *Photius*, cod. 107), eccles. hist. libb. III. from A. D. 450 – 518 (*Photius*, cod. 42), and that of the Monophysite *Zacharias Rhetor*, Bishop of Melitine (Extracts from Socrates and Theodoret, and a continuation to A. D. 547) are no longer extant. [Fragments in *Evagrius* and in *Assemani* Bibl. orient. T. II. p. 53 seq.]

Still extant are *Theodorus Lector* (in Fragments), *Evagrius Scholasticus* and *Nicephorus Callistus* (vid. § 73).

2. Profane historians: *Procopius* Cæsariensis († after 552) de bello Persico libb. II., de bello Vandalico libb. II., de bello Gothico libb. IV. (ed. Dav. Hœschelius August. Vindel. 1607. fol.) historia arcana Justiniani, Theodoræ etc. (ed. J. Eichel. Helmst. 1654. 4to.) continued by *Agathias* from 552 – 559 in 5 Books (ed. B. Vulcanius. Lugd. Bat. 1594. 4to.).

Chronicon paschale (comp. p. 306).

Theophanes Confessor († 817) chronographia (from A. D. 285 to 813) cum notis J. Goari et F. Combefisii. Paris. 1655. (Venet. 1729) fol.

3. Imperial decrees: *Codex Justinianeus*, compiled by *Tribonianus* 529, codex repetitæ prælectionis 534. — Novellæ (*νεαραὶ διατάξεις μετὰ τὸν κώδικα*).

CHAPTER FIRST.

ENTIRE SUPPRESSION OF PAGANISM IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

§ 107.

In the East the last traces of paganism disappeared during the reign of Justinian I. (A. D. 527 – 565), the New-Platonic school at Athens being abolished in the year 529,[1] and the heathen compelled

---

[1] *Joh. Malala* (about A. D. 600) historia chronica (libb. XVIII.) from the Creation to the death of Justinian I. ed Humphredus Hodius. Oxon. 1691. 8vo. P. II. p. 187. — Exile of the philosophers, Damascius, Isidorus, Simplicius, Eulamius, Hermias, Priscianus, etc. to Persia, *Agathias* lib. II.

to submit to baptism.[2] In the West the task was more difficult. As late as the end of the 5th century various heathen practices were still openly kept up at Rome, and were not without resistance abolished.[3] In Sicily,[4] and especially in Sardinia,[5] there were still many pagans as late as the year 600.

CHAPTER SECOND.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGICAL OPINIONS.

§ 108.

MONOPHYSITES.

Sources: Acts of Councils, collected by Mansi T. VII. p. 481; IX. p. 700. *Liberati* breviarium (see p. 399). — *Breviculus* hist. Eutych. (see p. 417). — *Leontii Byzantini* (about A. D. 600?) de sectis liber, in X actiones distributus (prim. ed Jo. Leunclavius in Legat. Manuelis Comneni ad Armenos. Basil. 1578. 8vo. in Gallandii bibl. PP. T. XII. p. 621 seq.), Actio V – X. *Ejusdem* contra Eutychianos et Nestorianos libb. III. (lat. ex Fr. Turriani versione in Canisii lection. ant. ed. Basnage, T. I. p. 535 seq. by Gallandius l. c. p. 658). *Zachariæ Rhet.* et *Theodori Lect. hist.* eccl. fragmenta. — *Evagrius* II. 5 seq. *Theophanes* ed. Paris. p. 92 seq.

Works: Walchs Ketzerhistorie Th. 6. S. 641 ff. Th. 7. and 8.

As the decisions of the council of Chalcedon (see § 87, p. 240) were evidently much more favorable to the Antiochian than the

---

[2] *Cod Justin.* Lib. I. Tit. XI. (*de Paganis et sacrificiis et templis*) L. 10. — *Theophanes* ed. Paris. p. 153. — Activity of *Johannes* Episc. Asiæ, see Assemani bibl. orient. T. II. p. 85 (Pfeiffers extract S. 209).

[3] cf. *Salvianus Massil.* (see § 77, note 10.) *Gelasius* P. (492 — 496) *adv. Andromachum Senatorem ceterosque Romanos, qui Lupercalia secundum morem pristinum colenda constituebant (Mansi* VIII. p. 95 seq). He shows of what sacrilege he is guilty — qui cum se Christianum videri velit, et profiteatur, et dicat, palam tamen publiceque prædicare non horreat, non refugiat, non pavescat, ideo morbos gigni, quia dæmonia non colantur, et deo Februario non litetur. — Quando Anthemius Imperator Romam venit (about A. D. 470), Lupercalia utique gerebantur. — dum hæc mala hodieque perdurant, ideo hæc ipsa imperia defecerunt, ideo etiam nomen Romanorum, non remotis etiam Lupercalibus, usque ad extrema quæque pervenit. Et ideo nunc ea removenda suadeo. — Postremo si de meorum persona præscribendum æstimas prædecessorum: unusquisque nostrorum administrationis suæ redditurus est rationem. — Ego negligentiam accusare non audeo prædecessorum, cum magis credam fortasse tentasse eos, ut hæc pravitas tolleretur, et quasdam extitisse causas et contrarias voluntates, quæ eorum intentionibus præpedirent: sicut ne nunc quidem vos istos absistere insanis conatibus velle perpenditis.

[4] *Gregor.* M. lib. III. epist. 62.

[5] *Gregor.* M. lib. IV. epist 26, ad Januar. Episc. Caralitanum. lib. V. epist. 41, ad Constantinam Augustam.

Egyptian creed, the latter party were greatly dissatisfied. The monks in Palestine, led on by Theodosius, one of their number, rose in rebellion against their bishop; but though favored by the widowed empress Eudoxia, they were at length put down (A. D. 451–453).[1] In Alexandria a considerable party, headed by the presbyter Timothy and the diaconus Peter (called Mongus, or the Stammerer), separated entirely from the newly appointed bishop Proterius. This party insisted on retaining Cyril's doctrine, denying the coexistence of two natures in Christ, condemning the decrees of the council of Chalcedon as pure Nestorianism, and maintaining that Dioscurus was unjustly deprived of his office;[2] although they approved the condem-

---

[1] Besides the more general authorities, see the *Vita S. Euthymii* Abbatis († 472) by Cyril of Scythopolis (about A. D. 555), fullest by Simeon Metaphrastes, in Cotelerii monum. Eccles. græc. T. II. p. 200 seq., in a shorter form, perhaps the genuine one, in the Analectis græcis (ed. Benedictini mon. Jac. Lopinus, B. Montfaucon, Ant. Pugetus. Paris. 1688. 4to.) p. 1 seq.

[2] cf. *Severi* Patr. Antioch. sententiæ (prim. ed. *Mansi* T. VII. p. 831. *Gallandius* T. XII. p. 733): Δύο τὰς φύσεις ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ νοοῦμεν, τὴν μὲν κτιστὴν, τὴν δὲ ἄκτιστον· ἀλλ' οὐδεὶς ἐγράψατο τὴν ἐν Χαλκηδόνι σύνοδον τὴν ἄλογον ταύτην γραφὴν, τί δήποτε δύο φύσεις ὠνόμασαν περὶ τῆς τοῦ Ἐμμανουὴλ ἑνώσεως διαλαμβάνοντες· οὐδεὶς ταύτην ἔστησε τὴν κατηγορίαν, ἀλλ' ἐκείνην μάλα δικαίως, τί δήποτε μὴ ἀκαλουθήσαντες τῷ ἁγίῳ Κυρίλλῳ ἐκ δύο φύσεων ἔφασαν εἶναι τὸν Χριστόν. Οὐ παυσόμεθα λέγοντες, ὡς διιξάτω τις τὴν ἐν Χαλκηδόνι σύνοδον ἢ τὸν τόμον Λέοντος, τὴν καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἕνωσιν ὁμολογήσαντας, ἢ σύνοδον φυσικὴν, ἢ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἕνα Χριστὸν, ἢ μίαν φύσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένην· καὶ τότε γνωσόμεθα, ὡς κατὰ τὸν σοφώτατον Κυρίλλον, Θεωρίᾳ μόνῃ ἀνακρίνοντες τὴν οὐσιώδη διαφορὰν τῶν συνενεχθέντων ἀπορρήτως εἰς ἓν ἴσασι, καὶ ὡς ἑτέρα ἡ τοῦ λόγου φύσις, καὶ ἑτέρα ἡ τῆς σαρκός· καὶ ὡς δύο τὰ ἀλλήλοις συνενηνεγμένα καθορῶσι τῷ νῷ· διϊστῶσι δὲ οὐδαμῶς. Another fragment: καὶ τῶν, ἐξ ὧν ἡ ἕνωσις, μενόντων ἀμειώτων καὶ ἀναλλοιώτων, ἐν συνθέσει δὲ ὑφεστώτων καὶ οὐκ ἐν μονάσιν ἰδιοσυστάτοις. — *Collatio Catholicorum cum Severianis* habita Constantinop. anno 531, Mansi T. VIII. p. 822: Quod *ex duabus* quidem *naturis* dicere unam significat Dei verbi naturam incarnatam, secundum b. Cyrillum et seq. patres: *in duabus* autem *naturis* duas personas et duas subsistentias significat. At the same time they allowed κατὰ σάρκα ὁμοούσιος ἡμῖν, (*Leontius* de sectis act. 5. *Evagrius* III. 5) — *Severus* in *Anastasius Sinaita* (about A. D. 560) in the Ὁδηγὸς adv. Acephalos (prim. ed. J. Gretser. Ingolst. 1606. 4to.) c. 18: ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῆς μιᾶς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύσεως, μέρος μὲν ταύτης ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχὴ, μέρος δὲ τὸ σῶμα, οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῆς μιᾶς αὐτοῦ φύσεως, μέρους τάξιν ἐπέχει ἡ θεότης, καὶ μέρους τὸ σῶμα. The same comparison used by Xenaias (in Assemani bibl. orient. T. II. p. 25) and generally by the Monophysites *Gelasius* I. (bishop of Rome 492—496) de duabus naturis in Christo adv. Eutychen et Nestorium (in Bibl. PP. and in Jo. Heroldi hæresecologia. Basil. 1556, p. 686): Adhuc autem etiam illud adjiciunt, ut sicut ex duabus rebus constat homo, id est ex anima et corpore, quamvis utriusque rei sit diversa natura, sicut dubium non habetur, plerumque tamen usus loquendi singulariter pronunciet, simul utrumque complectens, ut humanam dicat naturam, non humanas naturas: sic potentiam in Christi mysterio, et unitionem divinitatis atque humanitatis unam dici vel debere vel posse naturam: non considerantes, quia cum una natura dicatur humana, quæ tamen ex duabus constet, id est ex anima et corpore principaliter, illa causa est, qua nec initialiter anima alibi possit existere, quam in corpore, nec corpus valeat constare sine anima: et merito, quæ alterutro sibi sit causa existendi, pariter unam abusive dici posse naturam, quæ sibi invicem causam præbeat, ut ex alterutro natura subsistat humana, salva proprietate duntaxat duarum. Thus the question in this controversy was concerning expressions much more than ideas. Some Monophysites, it is true, went farther, comp. Zacharias in the following note 3, as had done certain Egyptians formerly, comp. § 87, note 2.

nation of Eutyches.[3] Of the numerous names, by which they were known,[4] the most common was that of Μονοφυσῖται (Monophysites): whilst they called the other party Δυοφυσῖται (Duophysites).

The death of Marcian (A. D. 457) inspired the Monophysites with new hopes. At Alexandria they rose tumultuously, and having killed Proterius, chose Timotheus Ælurus bishop in his stead. The emperor Leo I. (A. D. 457–474) actually submitted it once more to the decision of the bishops, whether they would adhere to the decrees of the council of Chalcedon, or not. But as the majority decided in favor of these decrees,[5] Timothy Ælurus was ban-

---

[3] *Collatio Cathol. cum Severianis* Mansi T. VIII. p. 818: qualem opinionem de Eutyche habetis? *Orientales dixerunt:* Tanquam hæreticus, magis autem princeps hæresis. Exaggerated notions concerning the doctrine of Eutyches: *Zacharias* (ap. Evagrium III. 5): οἱ τὴν Εὐτυχοῦς φανταστάσιαν νοσοῦντες, ἀνὰ τὴν βασιλεύουσαν, καὶ τὸν μονήρη διώκοντες βίον, ὥσπερ ἱμαίῳ τινὶ περιτυχεῖν οἰηθέντες Τιμοθέῳ (Aeluro) — — δρομαῖοι παρ' αὐτὸν ἀφικνοῦνται, καὶ ὡς διελεγχθέντες πρὸς Τιμοθέου ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν εἶναι κατὰ σάρκα τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον, καὶ τῷ πατρὶ ὁμοούσιον κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐς τοὐπίσω ἀνεχώρουν. *Hormisdæ* P. epist. 30, ad Cæsarium: Eutyches carnis negans veritatem, — ut *Manichæam phantasiam* ecclesiis Christi — insereret etc. *Justinianus* in Codice I. 1, 5: (anathematizamus) et Eutychetem mente captum, *phantasiam inducentem*, negantem autem veram ex sancta semper virgine et Deipara Maria incarnationem, neque confitentem per omnia consubstantialem Patri secundum divinitatem, et consubstantialem nobis secundum humanitatem. *Vigilius Tapsensis* (about A. D. 484) adv. Eutychen libb. V. (opp. ed. P. F. Chifletius. Divione 1664, 4to.) in the beginning of lib. III.: Euthyciana hæresis in id impietatis prolapsa est errore, ut non solum verbi et carnis unam credat esse naturam, verum etiam hanc eandem carnem non de sacro Mariæ virginis corpore adsumtam, sed de cœlo dicat, juxta infandum Valentini et Marcionis errorem, fuisse deductam. Ita pertinaciter verbum carnem adserens factum, ut per virginem, ac si aqua per fistulam, transisse videatur, non tamen ut de virgine aliquid, quod nostri sit generis, adsumsisse credatur. *Liberatus* c. 11. Samuel, bishop of Edessa, even went so far as to attempt to prove to the Eutychians, veram humani generis carnem a Deo assumtam, et non de cœlo exhibitam, nec crassi aëris substantiam in carne incessisse formatam (*Gennadius* de vir. illustr. c. 82).

[4] At different times and places, e. g. Acephali, Severiani, Ægyptii, Jacobitæ, Timotheani, etc. — *Facundus* Episc. Hermianensis (about A. D. 540) pro defensione III. capitulorum (libb. V. prim. ed. Jac. Sirmond. Paris. 1629. 8vo. Gallandius T. XI. p. 665) lib. I. c. 5, and IV. c. 3: Acephali vocantur a Græcis, quos significantius nos *Semicutychianos* possumus appellare. This name, however, never became usual.

[5] Their letters are collected in the codex encyclius. Mansi T. VII. p. 777 seq. Ibid. p. 521 seq. The most remarkable *Epist. Episcoporum Pamphyliæ* Ibid. p. 573 seq.: — doctrina — quæ a S. Nicæno concilio gratia spiritali prolata est — omnia complet et omnibus valde sufficit. — Nos et Nicænam synodum debito honore veneramur, et Chalcedonensem quoque suscipimus, veluti scutum eam contra hæreticos opponentes, et non anathema (leg. mathema, μάθημα) fidei existentem. Non enim ad populum a papa Leone et a S. Chalcedonensi concilio scripta est, ut ex hoc debeant scandalum sustinere, sed tantummodo sacerdotibus, ut habeant quo possint repugnare contrariis. Duarum namque naturarum sive substantiarum unitatem in uno Christo declaratam invenimus a pluribus apud nos consistentibus sanctis et religiosissimis patribus, et nequaquam veluti mathema aut symbolum his qui baptizantur hoc tradimus, sed ad bella hostium reservamus. Si vero propter medelam eorum, qui per simplicitatem scandalizati noscuntur, placuerit vestræ potentiæ, Christo amabilis imperator, S. Leoni Rom. civ. episcopo, nec non aliorum pariter sanctitati, propter istorum (sicut dixi) condescensionem et satisfactionem, quatenus idem sanctissimus vir literis suis declaret, quia non est symbolum neque mathema epistola, quæ tunc ab

ished, and Timothy *σαλοφακίολος* appointed bishop (A. D. 460), who succeeded in preserving the tranquillity of the city by his conciliating conduct towards the other party. Soon after this, new commotions began in Antioch itself. Peter the Fuller (Fullo), a monk of Constantinople, and opposed to the council of Chalcedon, attempted to introduce the favorite Monophysite form *θεὸς ἐσταυρώθη* (*God was crucified*) into the Trishagion.[6] Having gained over the monks to his party, he succeeded in deposing the patriarch, and assumed that dignity himself. Not long after, however, he was banished by an imperial decree (about the year 470), and there seemed at length reason to hope that this subject of controversy would gradually be every where forgotten.

But this hope proved delusive. For the emperor Basiliscus, having driven Zeno Isauricus from the throne (A. D. 475–477), declared for the Monophysites, reinstated Timothy Ælurus and Peter the Fuller in their places, and summoned all the bishops in the *Ἐγκύκλιον* (or circular) to condemn the synod of Chalcedon.[7]

It was not long indeed before the persevering Acacius, patriarch of Constantinople, succeeded in restoring Zeno to the throne by exciting a popular tumult (A. D. 477–491), but in the mean time the

---

eo ad sanctæ memoriæ nostrum archiepiscopum Flavianum directa est, et quod a sancto concilio dictum est, sed hæreticæ pravitatis potius increpatio: simul et illud, quod ab eis est dictum, "*in duabus naturis*," quod forte eis dubium esse dignoscitur, dum a patre prolatum sit propter eos, qui veram Dei verbi incarnationem negant, his sermonibus apertius indicatum, ita tamen, ut in nullo sanctæ synodo fiat injuria. Nihil enim differt, sive duarum naturarum unitas inconfusa dicatur, sive ex duabus eodem modo referatur. Sed neque si una dicatur verbi natura, inferatur autem incarnata, aliud quid significat, sed idem honestiori sermone declarat. Nam et invenimus sæpius hoc dixisse seq. patres. Apud vestræ pietatis imperium, quod significat vestra potentia decenter ago, quia ipsa synodus permanebit, sicut ecclesiæ membra discerpta copulabuntur hoc sermone curata, et ea, quæ contra sacerdotes nefanda committuntur, cessabunt, et ora hæreticorum contra nos aperta damnabuntur, et omnia reducentur ad pacem, et fiet, sicut scriptum est, unus grex et unus pastor. Quoniam et dominus Christus multa condescensione circa nos usus, et humanum salvavit genus: et quia cum dives esset, utique divinitate, pauper factus est pro nobis, secundum quod homo fieri voluit, ut nos illa paupertate ditaremur, sicut b. Paulus edicit, etc.

[6] The old *τρίσαγιον* consisted in the words Jes. 6, 3. Miraculous origin of the new one in the reign of Theodosius II. (Felicis Papæ ep. ad Petrum Full. *Mansi* T. VII. p. 1041. Acacii ep. ad eund. The same, p. 1121): *Ἅγιος ὁ θεός, ἅγιος ἰσχυρός, ἅγιος ἀθάνατος (ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι' ἡμᾶς), ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς.* cf. *Suiceri* thes. T. II. p. 1310 seq. *Bingham* VI. p. 37 seq. Walchs Ketzerhistorie Th. 7. S. 239 ff.

[7] In the *Ἐγκύκλιον* (*Evagrius* III. 4) we read: *τὰ διελόντα τὴν ἕνωσιν καὶ εὐταξίαν τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησιῶν καὶ εἰρήνην τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς, δηλαδὴ τὸν λεγόμενον τόμον Λέοντος, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν Χαλκηδόνι ἐν ὅρῳ πίστεως ἢ ἐκθέσει συμβόλων — εἰρημένα καὶ πεπραγμένα εἰς καινοτομίαν κατὰ τοῦ μνημονευθέντος ἁγίου συμβόλου τῶν τριῶν ἁγίων πατέρων, θεσπίζομεν ἐνταῦθα τε καὶ πανταχοῦ καθ' ἑκάστην ἐκκλησίαν παρὰ τῶν ἁπανταχοῦ ἁγιωτάτων ἐπισκόπων ἀναθεμασίζεσθαι, καὶ πυρὶ παραδίδοσθαι παρ' οἷς ἂν εὑρίσκηται. — θεσπίζομεν τοὺς πανταχοῦ ἁγιωτάτους ἐπισκόπους ἐμφανιζομένῳ τῷ θείῳ τούτῳ ἡμῶν ἐγκυκλίῳ γράμματι καθυπογράψειν σαφῶς καταμηνύοντας, ὅτι δὴ μόνῳ τῷ θείῳ στοιχοῦσι συμβόλῳ τῶν τριῶν ἁγίων πατέρων, ὅστερ ἐπεσφράγισαν οἱ ὧν πατέρες ἅγιοι, ὡς ἔδοξεν ὁρισικῶς καὶ τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα συνελθοῦσι κατὰ τὴν Ἐφεσίων μητρόπολιν ὀρθοδόξοις καὶ ὁσίοις πατράσιν.*

Monophysites had gained so much strength, that it was deemed expedient to issue the Henoticon[8] (A. D. 482), in which the contested points were treated of in such general terms that it could be objected to by no party. Peter Mongus (or the Stammerer) was now made patriarch of Alexandria, and subscribed to the Henoticon. Many of the Monophysites, however, being displeased at this, separated from him, and were called the Ἀκέφαλοι (*without a leader*). Peter Fullo was once more appointed patriarch of Antioch (A. D. 485), though many of the Syrian bishops refused to sign the Henoticon and were displaced. But the most determined opposition to all union with the Monophysites was on the part of the Roman patriarchs, who, since the downfall of the Western empire (A. D. 476), had become wholly independent of the emperors. All remonstrance proving vain, Felix II. issued an anathema against Acacius (A. D. 484),[9] and all communion between the Eastern and Western churches was broken off.

And even in the East the Henoticon proved but a weak bond of union, the unsettled questions offering continual subjects of dispute. In Constantinople the sentiment was rather in favor of the council of Chalcedon, and the Acœmetæ (see § 93, p. 275) even continued in communion with the church of Rome. In Alexandria, on the contrary, the decrees of this council were rejected; and in the East the opinions on the subject were divided. All these churches were externally united indeed by the Henoticon, but under such circumstances there could not fail to be a mutual coldness, and this often led to open quarrels. Such was the situation of things at the accession of

---

[8] Evagrius III. 14 (best. ed. in *I. W. Berger*. henotica Orientis. Vitemb. 1723. 4to.): Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Ζήνων — τοῖς κατὰ Ἀλεξάνδρειαν καὶ Αἴγυπτον, καὶ Λιβύην καὶ Πεντάπολιν κ. τ. λ. — γινώσκειν ὑμᾶς ἐσπουδάσαμεν, ὅτι καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ αἱ πανταχοῦ ἐκκλησίαι ἕτερον σύμβολον, ἢ μάθημα, ἢ ὅρον πίστεως, ἢ πίστιν πλὴν τοῦ εἰρημένου ἁγίου συμβόλου τῶν τριῶν ἁγίων πατέρων, ὅπερ ἐβεβαίωσαν οἱ μνημονευθέντες ρν' ἅγιοι πατέρες, οὔτε ἐσχήκαμεν, οὔτε ἔχομεν, οὔτε ἕξομεν. — ᾧ καὶ ἐξηκολούθησαν οἱ ἅγιοι πατέρες οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἐφεσίων συνελθόντες, οἱ καὶ καθελόντες τὸν ἀσεβῆ Νεστόριον, καὶ τοὺς τὰ ἐκείνου μετὰ ταῦτα φρονοῦντας. ὅντινα καὶ ἡμεῖς Νεστόριον ἅμα καὶ Εὐτυχῆ, τἀναντία τοῖς εἰρημένοις φρονοῦντας, ἀναθεματίζομεν, δεχόμενοι καὶ τὰ ιβ' κεφάλαια τὰ εἰρημένα παρὰ τοῦ τῆς ὁσίας μνήμης γενομένου Κυρίλλου ἀρχιεπισκόπου τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἁγίας καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας. Ὁμολογοῦμεν δὲ τὸν μονογενῆ τοῦ θεοῦ υἱὸν καὶ θεὸν τὸν κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν τὸν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, κατελθόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου καὶ θεοτόκου, ἕνα τυγχάνειν καὶ οὐ δύο. ἑνὸς γὰρ εἶναι φαμὲν τά τε θαύματα καὶ τὰ πάθη, ἅπερ ἑκουσίως ὑπέμεινε σαρκί. τοὺς γὰρ διαιροῦντας, ἢ συγχέοντας, ἢ φαντασίαν εἰσάγοντας οὐδὲ ὅλως δεχόμεθα· ἐπείπερ ἡ ἀναμάρτητος κατὰ ἀλήθειαν σάρκωσις ἐκ τῆς θεοτόκου, προσθήκην υἱοῦ εὐ πεποίηκε. — πάντα δὲ τὸν ἕτερόν τι φρονήσαντα, ἢ φρονοῦντα, ἢ νῦν ἢ πώποτε, ἢ ἐν Χαλκηδόνι, ἢ οἵᾳ δήποτε συνόδῳ, ἀναθεματίζομεν.

[9] *Felicis epist. ad Acacium* ap. Mansi VII. p. 1053. The conclusion: Habe ergo cum his, quos libenter amplecteris, portionem ex sententia præsenti, quam per tuæ tibi direximus ecclesiæ defensorem, sacerdotali honore, et communione catholica, nec non etiam a fidelium numero segregatus; sublatum tibi nomen et munus ministerii sacerdotalis agnosce, S. Spiritus judicio et apostolica auctoritate damnatus, *numquamque anathematis vinculis exuendus.* — *Theophanes* p. 114: Ἀκάκιος δὲ ἀναισθήτως ἔσχε περὶ τὴν καθαίρεσιν, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ (τοῦ Φίλικος) ἐξῆρε τῶν διπτύχων.

the emperor Anastasius (A. D. 491 – 518). He adopted the principle of avoiding all interference in religious matters, except to protect the peace of the citizens against fanaticism.[10] But even in this he did not succeed, and in a fanatical commotion at Constantinople he was forced by the threats of the seditious Vitalianus, the advocate of the council of Chalcedon (A. D. 514), to promise a renewal of the church-communion with Rome. But all attempts to bring this about were frustrated by the extravagant demands of the Roman patriarch; and Anastasius was followed to his grave by the hatred of all the friends of the council of Chalcedon; as may be seen by the various traditions concerning him.[11]

At length Justin I. (A. D. 518 – 527) was forced by a popular tumult formally to adopt the decrees of the council of Chalcedon, and renew the church-communion with Rome. The same measures were soon after taken in the East, and the Monophysite bishops, *Severus*, patriarch of Antioch, *Xenajas*, or *Philoxenus*, bishop of Mabug, and *Julian*, bishop of Halicarnassus, displaced. They took refuge for the most part in Alexandria, where the Monophysites were still too strong to be attacked.

---

[10] *Evagrius* III. 30: Οὗτος ὁ Ἀναστάσιος εἰρηναῖος τὶς ὤν, οὐδὲν καινουργεῖσθαι παντελῶς ἠβούλετο, διαφερόντως περὶ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν κατάστασιν. — Ἡ μὲν οὖν εν Χαλκηδόνι σύνοδος ἀνὰ τούτους τοὺς χρόνους οὔτε ἀναφανδὸν ἐν ταῖς ἁγιωτάταις ἐκκλησίαις ἐκηρύττετο, οὔτε μὴν ἐκ πάντων ἀπεκηρύττετο. ἕκαστοι δὲ τῶν προσδρευόντων, ὡς εἶχον νομίσεως, διεπράττοντο. Κἂν ἔνιοι μὲν τῶν ἐκπεπειμένων αὐτῇ μάλα γεννικῶς ἀντείχοντο, καὶ πρὸς οὐδεμίαν ἐνδιδοσαν συλλαβὴν τῶν ὁρισθέντων παρ' αὐτῆς, οὐ μὴν γράμματος ἀλλαγὴν παρεδέχοντο, ἀλλὰ καὶ μετὰ πολλῆς ἀπιπήδων τῆς παῤῥησίας, καὶ κοινωνεῖν παντελῶς οὐκ ἠνείχοντο τοῖς μὴ δεχομένοις παῤ αὐτης τὰ ἐκτιθέμενα. Ἕτεροι δὲ οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἐδέχοντο τὴν ἐν Χαλκηδόνι σύνοδον καὶ τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς ὁρισθέντα, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀναθέματι περιέβαλον αὐτήν τε καὶ τὸν Λέοντος τόμον. Ἄλλοι τοῖς ἐνωτικοῖς Ζήνωνος ἐνισχυρίζοντο καὶ ταῦτα πρὸς ἀλλήλους διεῤῥωγότες τῇ τε μιᾷ καὶ ταῖς δύο φύσεσιν, οἱ μὲν τῇ συνθήκῃ τῶν γραμμάτων κλαπέντες, οἱ δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὸ εἰρηνικώτερον μᾶλλον ἀποκλίναντες· ὡς πάσας τὰς ἐκκλησίας εἰς ἰδίας ἀποκριθῆναι μοίρας, καὶ μηδὲ κοινωνεῖν ἀλλήλοις τοὺς προσδρεύοντας. — Ἅπερ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀναστάσιος θεώμενος τοὺς νεωτερίζοντας τῶν ἐπισκόπων ἐξωθεῖτο, εἴ που κατειλήφει ἢ παρὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς τοῖς τόποις τινὰ τὴν ἐν Χαλκηδόνι σύνοδον κεῤῥύτοντα, ἢ ταύτην ἀναθέματι περιτιθέντα.

[11] *Evagrius* III. 32: ὁ Ἀναστάσιος δόξαν μανιχαϊκῆς (νομίσεως) παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς εἶχεν. *Theodor. Lect.* II. 6: Μανιχαῖοι καὶ Ἀρειανοὶ ἔχαιρον Ἀναστασίῳ. Μανιχαῖοι μὲν, ὡς τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ ζηλούσης αὐτοὺς (*Symmachi P. Ep. ad Orientales. Mansi* VIII. p. 220: Declinemus sacrilegum Eutychetis errorem cum Manichæa malitia congruentem), Ἀρειανοὶ δὲ ὡς Κλέαρχον τὸν Θεῖον πρὸς μητρὸς Ἀναστασίου ὁμόδοξον ἔχοντες. *Victor Episc. Tununensis* (about A. D. 555) in his Chronicon (in Canisii lectt. ant. ed. Basnage, vol. I. p. 326): *Messala* V. C. Cos. Constantinopoli, jubente Anastasio Imperatore, sancta Evangelia, tamquam ab idiotis Evangelistis composita, reprehenduntur et emendantur. (*P. Wesselingii diss. de Evangeliis jussu Imp. Anast. non emendatis* appended to his *diatribe de Judæorum Archontibus. Traj. ad Rh.* 1738). On the other hand *Liberati Breviarium* c. 19: Hoc tempore Macedonius Constantinopolitanus episcopus ab imperatore Anastasio dicitur expulsus, tamquam evangelia falsasset, et maxime illud Apostoli dictum: *qui apparuit in carne, justificatus est in spiritu* (1 Tim. 3, 16). Hunc enim immutasse, ubi habet ΟΣ id est *Qui*, Monosyllabum græcum, littera mutata O in Θ, vertisse et fecisse ΘΣ, id est *Deus*, ut esset: *Deus apparuit per carnem.* Tamquam Nestorianus ergo culpatus expellitur per Severum monachum. — *P. E. Jablonski exercit. de morte tragica Anastasii Dicori Francof. ad Viadr.* 1744 (in *Ejusd. Opusc. ed. te Water* T. IV. p. 353).

But this congregating of so many bishops at Alexandria led to internal divisions amongst the Monophysites themselves.[12] The first and most obstinate grew out of the controversy between Severus and Julian, concerning the corruptible nature of Christ's body. The opposite parties were called by the names of their leaders Severians (also Theodosians, *Φθαρτολάτραι*), and Julianists (or Phantasiastæ, Gaianitæ, *Ἀφθαρτοδοκῆται*). A sect of the former party were afterwards called *Ἀγνοηταὶ*, or Themistiani, whilst the latter was divided into the *Ἀκτιστηταὶ* and *Κτιστολάτραι*. About the year 560, the celebrated John Philoponus († A. D. 610 or later),[13] promulgated amongst the Monophysites his Aristotelian errors concerning the Trinity,[14] and the resurrection.[15] His followers were called Philoponiaci, Tritheitæ. Damianus, patriarch of Alexandria, on the other hand, seems to have fallen into the Sabellian errors. Nearly at the same time Stephanus Niobes was condemned by the other Monophysites for teaching that the two natures were so commingled in Christ that no distinction whatever could be made between them.[16]

§ 109.

CONTROVERSIES UNDER JUSTINIAN I.

Justinian I. (A. D. 527–565), himself a zealous advocate of the decrees of the council of Chalcedon, but much influenced by his empress Theodora, who favored the Monophysites, was ambitious of the honor of restoring order and uniformity in the church, as well as

---

[12] Concerning them, see *Timotheus* presbyter de variis hæreticis ac diversis eorum in ecclesiam recipiendi formulis, in Cotelerii Monum. Eccles. Gr. T. III. p. 377 seq. — Walchs Ketzerhist. Th. 8. S. 520 ff.

[13] His writings were: In Hexaëmeron, Disp. de Paschate (ed. B. Corderius. Vienn. 1630. 4to. in Gallandius T. XII. p. 471). De æternitate mundi contra Proclum lib. (Venet. 1535). Commentary to Aristotle. — Amongst other lost works was one adv. Synod. Chalcedonensem (Photius cod. 55). *Fabricii bibl. gr.* vol. IX. p. 359 seq. (*ed Harles* vol. X. p. 639 seq.)

[14] *Leontius* de sectis act. V. § 6, makes Philoponus say to the church: *εἰ δύο λέγετε φύσεις ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἀνάγκη ὑμᾶς καὶ δύο ὑποστάσεις εἰπεῖν. — ναὶ ταὐτό ἐστι φύσις καὶ ὑπόστασις. Εἶτα πάλιν ἡ ἐκκλησία· εἰ ταὐτό ἐστι φύσις καὶ ὑπόστασις, οὐκοῦν λέγομεν καὶ τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος τρεῖς φύσεις, ἐπειδὴ ὁμολογουμένως τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις ἔχει. — Ἀπεκρίνατο ὁ Φιλόπονος· ὅτι καὶ ἔστω τρεῖς φύσεις λέγειν ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος. Ἔλεγε δὲ ταῦτα λαβὼν τὴν ἀφορμὴν ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀριστοτελικῶν· ὁ γὰρ Ἀριστοτέλης φησὶν, ὅτι εἰσὶ τῶν ἀτόμων καὶ μερικαὶ οὐσίαι, καὶ μία κοινή· οὕτως οὖν καὶ ὁ Φιλόπονος ἔλεγεν, ὅτι εἰσὶ τρεῖς μερικαὶ οὐσίαι ἐπὶ τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος, καὶ ἔστι μία κοινή.* Comp. the important Fragments from Philoponi dial. *Διαιτητῆς* in *Joh. Damascenus* de hæresibus c. 83. — His book on the Trinity directed against John, Patriarch of Constant. (Photius cod. 75), is lost. *J. G. Scharfenberg de Joh. Philop. Tritheismi defensore diss. Lips.* 1768. 4to.

[15] Timotheus in Cotelerii monum. eccles. Gr. T. III. p. 413 seq. Philoponus' book *περὶ ἀναστάσεως* (Photius cod. 21) is lost.

[16] *Dionysius* Patr. Antioch. in Assemani Bibl. Orient. T. II. p. 72. *Timotheus* l. c. p. 397, 407 seq. 417 seq. [The Monophysites held that the divine and human natures of Christ were so united as to constitute but one nature, yet without any conversion, confusion, or commixture, and that this might be understood they

in the laws; but his continual interference in the theological controversies only served to increase them.

The conferences which he caused to be held between the bishops of the Catholic church and the Monophysites[1] were, on the whole, fruitless. The Monophysite formula, "God was crucified," which under Justin I. (A. D. 519 – 521) certain Scythian monks had in vain attempted to introduce either at Rome or Constantinople,[2] had in the mean time been adopted by many of the orthodox also, especially in the East (θεοπασχῖται),[3] and was now admitted by Justinian (A. D. 533) to be orthodox, with the evident purpose of conciliating the Monophysites;[4] though in this too he was disappointed. In

often said, there is but one nature in Christ, yet it is *twofold*, or compound. *Murdock's Mosheim.* vol. I. p. 439]. Tr.

[1] The Protocol of one A. D. 531: collatio Catholicorum cum Severianis *Mansi* T. VIII. p. 817. — *Johannes* Episc. Asiæ speaks of several in Assemani Bibl. Orient. T. II. p. 89.

[2] Walch l. c. S. 262 – 311. *Hormisdæ* ep. ad Possessorem Episc. Afric. Constantinopoli exulantem (ap. Mansi T. VIII. p. 498): Ubi non variæ tentationis aculei? Quales per hunc fere jugem annum quorumdam Scytharum, qui monachos præ se ferebant specie non veritate, professione non opere, subtili tectas calliditate versutias, et sub religionis obtentu famulantia odiis suis venema pertulimus. — Nunquam apud eos caritas novo commendata præcepto, nunquam pax dominico relicta discessu: una pertinacis cura propositi, rationi velle imperare, non credere: contemtores auctoritatum veterum, novarum cupidi quæstionum; solam putantes scientiæ rectam viam, qualibet concepta facilitate sententiam: eousque tumoris elati, ut [*ad*] arbitrium suum: utriusque orbis putent inclinandum esse judicium, etc. To this the answer of one of the Scythian monks *Joh. Maxentii ad epist. Hormisdæ responsio* (Bibl. PP. Lugdun. T. IX. p. 539 seq. Colon. T. VI. P. I. p. 375 seq.): — Non est facile credendum hanc esse epistolam cujus fertur nomine titulata, præsertim quum in ea nihil, ut diximus, rationis aut consequentiæ reperiatur, sed tota criminationibus obtrectationibusque vanis — videatur referta. — Quod monachis responsum quærentibus Romanus Episcopus dare omnino distulerit, eosdemque post multa maris pericula, longique itineris vexationem, nec non etiam afflictionem prolixi temporis, quo eos apud se detinuit, vacuos et sine ullo effectu ad has partes venire compulerit, quod omnibus pene catholicis notum est, nec ipsi queunt hæretici denegare. — Nam et ipsi hæretici ad hoc ubique hanc ipsam, cui respondimus, epistolam proferunt, quatenus et sæpedictis monachis invidiam concitent, et omnes quasi ex auctoritate ejusdem Romani Episcopi prohibeantur *Christum filium Dei unum confiteri ex trinitate.* Sed quis hanc sententiam catholicam non esse ausus est profiteri, quam universa veneratur et amplectitur Dei ecclesia? Confidenter etenim dicere audeo, non quod, si per epistolam, sed quod, si viva voce hic in præsenti positus idem Romanus prohiberet Episcopus Christum filium Dei unum confiteri ex sancta et individua trinitate, nunquam eidem Dei ecclesia acquiesceret, nunquam ut Episcopum catholicum veneraretur, sed omnino ut hæreticum penitus execraretur. Quia quisquis hoc non confitetur, non est dubium, quod Nestorianæ perfidiæ tenebris excæcatus, quartum et extraneum a sancta et ineffabili Trinitate eum qui pro nobis crucem sustinuit, prædicare contendat. — An forte illos rationi credere, non imperare judicat, qui *Christum unam personam quidem ex Trinitate,* non autem *unum ex Trinitate* esse fatentur? Sed hi qui hoc dicunt, potius rationi velle imperare non credere, penitus convincuntur, etc. The Episcopi Africani in Sardinia exules sided also with the Scythian monks: comp, *Fulgentius Ruspensis* lib. de incarnatione et gratia Dom. nostri J. C. ad Mon. Scyth. (Bibl. PP. Col. T. VI. P. I. p. 81 seq. Fulgentii opera ed. Paris. 1684. 4to. p. 277 seq.) *Fulgentius Ferrandus* Diac. Carthag. ad Anatolium Diac. Rom. *Dionysius exiguus* præf. ad versionem epistolæ Procli Archiep. Const. ad Armenos (in Mansi T. V. p. 419 seq.).

[3] Walchs Ketzerhist. Th. 7. S. 256, 261, 311 ff.

[4] The Monophysites accused their adversaries of denying dominum passum

Egypt the Monophysites still continued to be the ruling sect, although Justinian, in the year 536, once more appointed a Catholic bishop at Alexandria.

On the other hand, the secret endeavours of Theodora to spread the Monophysite doctrines in Rome and Constantinople were equally unsuccessful. Anthimus, who had been made patriarch of Constantinople through her influence (A. D. 535), was soon after deposed (A. D. 536) for his adherence to these doctrines;[5] whilst Vigilius, whom she had advanced to the see of Rome (A. D. 538), with the secret understanding that he was to declare in their favor,[6] found it expedient to break through his agreement.

In the mean time these theological disputes were increased by the revival of the controversy with the Origenists, who had become very numerous amongst the monks in Palestine. One of them, Theodorus

---

carne, vel unum eum esse de sancta Trinitate, nec ejusdem esse personæ tam miracula quam passiones (cf. *Collatio Cathol. cum Sever. Mansi* T. VIII. p. 832). The Akœmetæ did really deny esse confitendum, b. Mariam vere et proprie Dei genitricem; et unum de trinitate incarnatum et carne passum (*Liberatus* c. 20,) evidently misled by their dependence on Rome (*Sam. Basnage* annal. politico-eccles. T. III. p. 701). *Justiniani lex* A. D. 533 (Cod. I. 1, 6). — Unius ac ejusdem passiones et miracula, quæ sponte pertulit in carne, agnoscentes. Non enim alium Deum Verbum, et alium Christum novimus, sed unum et eundem. — Mansit enim Trinitas et post incarnatum unum ex Trinitate Dei verbum: neque enim quartæ personæ adjectionem admittit sancta Trinitas. — Anathematizamus — *Nestorium* anthropolatram, et qui eadem cum ipso sentiunt — qui negant nec confitentur Dominum nostrum J. C. filium Dei et Deum nostrum incarnatum et hominem factum et crucifixum *unum esse ex sancta et consubstantiali Trinitate.* — *Epist. Joannis Ep. Romæ ad Justin.* (ibid. L. 8, and in Mansi T. VIII. p. 797 seq.): — comperimus, quod fidelibus populis proposuistis Edictum amore fidei pro submovenda hæreticorum intentione, secundum Apostolicam doctrinam, fratrum et Coëpiscoporum nostrorum interveniente consensu. Quod, quia Apostolicæ doctrinæ convenit, nostra auctoritate confirmamus. The addition to the Trishagian (see § 108, note 6) was admitted only by the Catholics in Syria, till rejected by the *Conc. Quinisextum* can. 81. After that, it was retained only by the Monophysites and Monotheletæ (Walchs Ketzergesch. Th. 9. S. 480).

[5] Acts of the Synod of Constantinople, A. D. 536, in Mansi T. VIII. p. 873 seq.

[6] *Liberatus* c. 22. Also in *Victoris* Tunun. Chronic. (Canisii lectt. ant. ed. Basnage T. I. p. 330) the Epist. Vigilii ad Theodosium, Anthimum et Severum Episc. where we read: me eam fidem, quam tenetis, Deo adjuvante et tenuisse et tenere significo. — Oportet ergo, ut hæc, quæ vobis scribo, nullus agnoscat, sed magis tanquam suspectum me sapientia vestra ante alios existimet habere, ut facilius possim hæc, quæ cœpi, operari et perficere. In the confession of faith added to this epistle in Liberatus: Non duas Christum confitemur naturas, sed ex duabus naturis compositum unum filium, unum Christum, unum Dominum. Qui dicit in Christo duas formas, unaquaque agente cum alterius communione, et non confitetur unam personam, unam essentiam, anathema. Qui dicit: quia hoc quidem miracula faciebat, hoc vero passionibus succumbebat (comp. S. 422 epist. Leonis): et non confitetur miracula et passiones unius ejusdemque, quas sponte sua sustinuit, carne nobis consubstantiali, anathema sit. Qui dicit, quod Christus velut homo misericordia dignatus est, et non dicit ipsum Deum Verbum et crucifixum esse, ut miseretur nobis, anathema sit. Anathematizamus ergo Paulum Samosatenum, Dioscorum (leg. Diodorum), Theodorum, Theodoritum et omnes, qui eorum statuta coluerint vel colunt. Soon after this, however, he proved his orthodoxy to the emperor and the patriarch of Constantinople. *Epist. ad Justinian. Mansi* T. IX. p. 35 seq. *ad Mennam* the same p. 38 seq.

Ascidas, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, being at court and high in the imperial favor, protected the Origenists in propagating their doctrines in Palestine; sometimes by violent means.[7] At last, however, by the aid of Mennas, patriarch of Constantinople, the other party prevailed, and obtained from Justinian the condemnation of the Origen errors (about the year 544).[8] Partly to be revenged on his orthodox opponents, no doubt, but still more for the sake of diverting attention from his own party, Theodorus now persuaded Justinian[9] that the reconciliation of the Monophysites with the church would be much furthered by the public condemnation, not only of Theodorus of Mopsvestia, who had long been in somewhat evil repute[10] amongst the orthodox, but also of Theodoret's writings against Cyril, and Ibas' letter to Maris, although the two last had been especially approved by the council of Chalcedon.[11] Justinian was thus induced to condemn the three chapters (*τρία κεφάλαια*, tria

---

[7] Chief authority *vita s. Sabæ* by Cyrillus Scythopolitanus (in *Cotelerii* monim. eccles. græc. T. III.) from c. 36. cf. *Walch de Sabaitis* (*Novi Comm. Soc. Gotting.* T. VII. *Comm. hist.* p. 1 seq.).

[8] In the Epist. ad Mennam Archiepisc. Const. adv. impium Origenem, *Mansi* T. IX. p. 487 — 538. In this, p. 524, Mennas is ordered, *συνεκκαγεῖν ἅπαντας τοὺς ἐνδημοῦντας κατὰ ταύτην τὴν βασιλίδα πόλιν ὁσιωτάτους ἐπισκόπους, καὶ τοὺς — μοναστηρίων ἡγουμένους, καὶ παρασκευάσαι πάντας — τὸν — Ὠριγένην — ἀναθεματίσαι,* and with this *σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα* originated without doubt the 15 Canons against Origen (prim. ed. Petr. Lambecius comment. bibl. August. Vindob. vol. VIII. p. 435 seq. *Mansi* T. IX. p. 395), though the title purports to be from the 5th œumen. council, see *M. Lequien* Oriens Christianus T. III. p. 210 seq. Walchs Ketzerhist. Th. 7. S. 660 ff.

[9] Domitian, bishop of Ancyra, a follower of Origen, allowed in a libello ad Vigilium himself (in *Facundi Episc. Hermianensis* pro defens. trium capitul. lib. IV. c. 4): prosiluerunt ad anathematizandos sanctissimos et gloriosissimos doctores sub occasione eorum, quæ de præexistentia et restitutione mota sunt, dogmatum, sub specie quidem Origenis, omnes autem, qui ante eum et post eum fuerunt, sanctos anathematizantes. Hi vero, qui proposuerant hujusmodi dogma defendere, id implere nullo modo voluerunt: sed talem relinquentes conflictum, conversi sunt, ut moverent adversus Theodorum, qui fuit Mopsvestenus episcopus, et moliri cœperunt, quatenus anathematizaretur et ille, ad abolitionem, ut putabant, eorum, quæ contra Origenem mota constiterant. *Liberatus* c. 24: Theodorus Cæsareæ Cappadociæ episcopus, dilectus et familiaris principum, — cognoscens Origenem fuisse damnatum, dolore damnationis ejus, ad ecclesiæ conturbationem, damnationem molitus est in Theodorum Mopsvestenum, eo quod Theodorus multa opuscula edidisset contra Origenem, exosusque et accusabilis haberetur ab Origenistis.

[10] Comp. the enmity of the Abbot Saba to him, Vita Sabæ (see note 7), c. 72, 74. — A synod assembled for the purpose at Mopsvest. A. D. 550, came to the result: Theodorum veterem, qui per istam civitatem fuit episcopus, in antiquis temporibus extra prædicationem divini mysterii fuisse, et sacris diptychis ejectum esse: et — in illius vocabulum, inscriptum esse Cyrillum sanctæ memoriæ (Mansi T. IX. p. 286). — The testimonia veterum contra Theod. in Coll. V. of the 5th œcum. council (Mansi T. IX. p. 230 seq) must be received with caution; for instance the name of Theodore in the two laws of Theodosius II. against Nestor (l. c. p. 249 seq.) is interpolated.

[11] Theodoretus in the Actio VIII. (Mansi T. VII. p. 189). Ibas after a long investigation, Act. IX. and X. after which the Roman ambassadors expressly declare: *ἀναγνωσθείσης σῆς ἐπιστολῆς αὐτοῦ* (that very Epist. ad Marin) *ἐπίγνωμεν αὐτὸν ὑπάρχειν ὀρθόδοξον.*

capitula).[12] In the East no material opposition was made to this measure, but in the West it was strenuously resisted.[13] On this Justinian summoned Vigilius, bishop of Rome, to Constantinople (A. D. 546), and there empowered him to condemn the three chapters in the so-called *judicatum* (A. D. 548).[14] But Vigilius was soon daunted by the decided resistance of the Western bishops,[15] and refused to adopt the second edict of the emperor against the three chapters (A. D. 551).[16]

Justinian now convened the fifth œcumenical synod at Constantinople in the year 553:[17] at which Vigilius not only refused to attend, but even defended the three chapters in a writing entitled *Constitutum.*[18] The synod broke off all church-communion with him, and approved without qualification all the edicts of the emperor.[19]

---

[12] i. e. three points, articles: not, according to the hypothesis of *J. H. Mücke* de tribus capitulis concilii Chalced. Lips. 1766. 4to. p. 6, *the three decrees of the Council of Chalcedon*, for there was no such decree concerning Theodoric. — The first Edict of Justinian is lost, excepting fragments in Facundus II. 3, IV. 4. See *Norisii* diss. de synodo quinta c. 3, Walchs Ketzergesch. Th. 8. S. 150 ff.

[13] The chief grounds of this resistance given by *Fulgentius Ferrandus* Epist. VI. ad Pelagium et Anatolium in the following rules: Ut concilii Chalcedonensis, vel similium nulla retractatio placeat, sed quæ semel statuta sunt intemerata serventur. Ut pro mortuis fratribus nulla generentur inter vivos scandala. Ut nullus libro suo per subscriptiones plurimorum dare velit auctoritatem, quam solis canonicis libris ecclesia catholica detulit.

[14] The particulars are related by *Facundus* lib. contra Mocianum Scholast. — The Judicatum is now no longer extant, excepting a fragment in the Latin translation of the Epist. Justin. ad Concilium œcum. V. (Mansi T. IX. p. 181).

[15] *Victor Tunun.* Chronicon (l. c. p. 332): Post Consulatum Basilii V. C. anno IX. (549). Illyriciana Synodus in defensione III. capitum Justiniano Aug. scribit: et Benenatum, primæ Justinianæ Civitatis episcopum, obtrectatorem eorumdem III. capitum condemnat — Post Cons. Bas. V. C. anno X. (550) Africani Antistites Vigilium Romanum Episcopum, damnatorem III. Capitulorum synodaliter a Catholica communione, reservato ei pœnitentiæ loco, recludunt, et pro defensione memoratorum III. Capitulorum literas satis idoneas Justiniano Principi per Olympium Magistrianum mittunt. Also the defence of the three chapters by Facundus and Rusticus.

[16] Or Ὁμολογία πίστιως Ἰουστ. Αὐτοκράτορος, preserved in the *Chronic. Alexandr.* ed. du Fresne p. 344 seq. *Mansi* T. IX. p. 537 seq. — Concerning the conduct of Vigilius, see esp. *Epistola Legatis Francorum, qui Constantinopolim proficiscebantur, ab Italiæ clericis directa*, A. D. 551. *Mansi* IX. p. 151 seq.

[17] Acta in *Mansi* T. IX. p. 157 seq. *Natalis Alexander* hist. eccl. sæc. VI. T. V. p. 502 seq. *J. Basnage* histoire de l'église liv. X. c. 6, *Norisii* diss. de synodo V. (Patav. 1673. opp. ed. Ballerini, Veron. 1729. T. I. p. 437). Against this last *Garnerii* diss. de syn. V. (first appended to his Liberatus. Paris. 1675. improved in the Auctar. opp. Theodoreti p. 493, reprinted in Theodoret. ed. Schulze T. V. p. 512 seq.) On the other side the Ballerini: defensio diss. Noris. adv. Garn. (in Noris. opp. T. IV. p. 985 seq.)

[18] *Mansi* T. IX. p. 61 – 106.

[19] The 13 Anathemas appended to Justinian's ὁμολογία (Mansi T. IX. p. 557 seq.) are for the most part verbally repeated in the 14 Anathemas of the Synod (l. c. p. 376 seq.). So also the 6th imperial Anathema in the 10th of the council: *Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον σαρκὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν εἶναι θεὸν ἀληθινὸν καὶ κύριον τῆς δόξης, καὶ ἕνα τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος, ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.*

Of the Origenists no notice was taken;[20] a circumstance which we shall not certainly be far from the truth in attributing to the artful management of Theodorus Ascidas, who played a conspicuous part in all these proceedings.

Vigilius at length (A. D. 554) subscribed to the decisions of the synod,[21] in which he was somewhat influenced, no doubt, by the success of the imperial arms in Italy under Narses. Immediately afterwards he set out on his return to Rome, but died on the way to Syracuse (A. D. 555). His successor, Pelagius, acknowledged at once the authority of the fifth synod,[22] which led to a long schism between Rome and several of the Western churches. The most distinguished of the writers, who opposed the condemnation of the three chapters, were *Fulgentius Ferrandus*, Diaconus of Carthage († some time before the year 551),[23] *Facundus*, bishop of Hermiane († about the year 570),[24] *Rusticus*, Diaconus at Rome,[25] *Liberatus*, Diaconus at Carthage (about the year 553),[26] and *Victor*, bishop of Tunnuna († some time after the year 565).[27]

---

[20] Though as early as *Cyril. Scythopolit.* in vita Sabæ c. 90, and *Evagrius* IV. 37, the 5th council was supposed to have condemned Origen, as was afterwards generally believed. The mistake arose from confounding this council with that under Mennas (see note 8). For proof of the mistake, see Walchs Ketzerhistorie. Th. 8. S. 280 ff.

[21] *Vigilii Epist. ad Eutychium Archiepisc. Constant.* prim. ed. *P. de Marca* in diss. de decreto Papæ Vigilii pro confirmatione V. Syn. (in *Ejusd.* dissertt. III. a Baluzio editis. Paris. 1669. 8vo. and annexed to Böhmers edit. of the concord. Sac. et Imp. p. 227) Mansi T. IX. p. 413 seq. The remarkable beginning: *Τὰ σκάνδαλα, ἅπερ ὁ τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου γένους ἐχθρὸς τῷ σύμπαντι κόσμῳ διήγειρεν, οὐδεὶς ἀγνοεῖ. οὕτως ὡς τὸ οἰκεῖον βούλημα πρὸς τὸ ἀνατρέψαι τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαν — πληρῶσαι οἵῳ δήποτε τρόπῳ σπουδάζοντα, οὐ μόνον ἐξ ὀνόματος ἰδίου, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ἡμετέρου καὶ ἐξ ἄλλων, διὰ τοῦ λέγειν ἢ τοῦ γράφειν, διάφορα πλάσασθαι πεποίηκεν· εἰς τοσοῦτον, ὅτι ἡμᾶς μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν καὶ συνεπισκόπων ἡμῶν — ἐν τῇ τῶν τεσσάρων συνόδων μιᾷ καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ πίστει ἀμώμους διαπιλοῦντας, τοῖς σοφίσμασι τῆς οὕτω πονηρᾶς πανουργίας, αὐτῶν ἐπεχείρισε διελεῖν. — Ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ Χριστὸς ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν — πάσης συγχύσεως τῆς ἡμῶν διανοίας ἀποκινηθείσης, πρὸς εἰρήνην τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀνεκαλέσατο κ. τ. λ.*

[22] *Victor Tunun. in Chron.* Post consulatum Basilii V. C. anno XVIII. Pelagius Romanus archidiaconus, trium præfatorum defensor Capitulorum, Justiniani principis persuasione de exsilio redit: et condemnans ea, quæ dudum constantissime defendebat, Romanæ Ecclesiæ Episcopus a prevaricatoribus ordinatur.

[23] Opp. ed. *Fr. Chifletius.* Divione 1649. Bibl. PP. Lugd. T. IX. Bibl. PP. *Gallandii* Tom. XI. p. 329 seq. Of his letters the most remarkable are those in answer to questions addressed to him from Rome ad Anatolium, quod unus de Trinitate passus dici possit, and ad Pelagium et Anatolium [546] pro tribus capitulis.

[24] By whom is the chief work in defence of the 3 capp. pro defensione III. Capitulorum libb. XII. (about 548) and contra Mocianum scholasticum (opp. prim. ed. *Jac. Sirmond.* Paris. 1629. 8vo. emendatius in Bibl. PP. *Gallandii* T. XI. p. 665 seq.)

[25] Lib. adv. Acephalos ad Sebastianum (in Bibl. PP. *Gallandius* T. XII. p. 37 seq.)

[26] Breviarium causæ Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum (ed. *Jo. Garnerius.* Paris. 1675. 8vo. *Mansi* IX. p. 659 and *Gallandius* XII. p. 119).

[27] Chronicon ab orbe condito, only the 2d part extant, A. D. 444 to 565 (in *Canisii* Lectt. ant. ed. *J. Basnage* T. I. p. 321 seq. plur. in locis restitut. *Gallandius* XII. p. 221).

The extreme anxiety of Justinian to reunite the Monophysites with the church, induced him, just before his death, to sanction as orthodox the doctrines of the Aphthartodocetæ (Ἀφθαρτοδοκηται· see § 108). Eutychius, bishop of Constantinople, was deposed for his resistance to this measure, and the like fate awaited Anastasius, the patriarch of Antioch, when, fortunately for him, the emperor died (A. D. 565), and the new doctrine was buried with him.[28]

§ 110.

HISTORY OF THE MONOPHYSITE CHURCHES.

The efforts of Justinian to reunite the Monophysites with the true church were so far from successful, that they were all the time becoming more distinct, and establishing new relations amongst themselves; and being afterwards peculiarly favored by the Arabs, the separation at length became entire and lasting.

In Alexandria the patriarch appointed by Justinian (A. D. 536) found but few adherents. The far more numerous Monophysites chose another patriarch, and continue to be known to this day under the name of Copts.[1] With these Copts the Ethiopian church was always nearly allied.[2]

When Armenia became subject to Persia (about the year 536), a council was held by authority of the Persian king Kesra (Chosroes), at which the decrees of the council of Chalcedon were rejected; ever since which the Armenians have formed a separate party in the church.[3]

In Syria and Mesopotamia the Monophysites had nearly become extinct through persecutions and want of a clergy, when they were again revived by Jacob Baradai, or Zanzalus, who, by his unwearied diligence (from A. D. 541 – 578), set in order their churches and supplied them with pastors. From him the Syrian Monophysites have the name of Jacobites.[4]

---

[28] *Evagrius* IV. 38–40. Walchs Ketzerhist. Th. 8 S. S. 578 ff.

[1] Taki eddini Makrizii († 1441) hist. Copt. Christ in Ægypto arab. et lat. ed. *H. J. Wetzer*, 1828. 8vo. *Eusebii Renaudot* historia patriarcharum Alexandrinorum Jacobitarum. Paris. 1713. 4to. — *Michael Le Quien* oriens christianus in IV. patriarchatus digestus, quo exhibentur ecclesiæ patriarchæ cæterique præsules totius Orientis (Paris. 1740. 3 T. fol.) T. II. p. 357.

[2] *Jobi Ludolf* historia Æthiopica Francof. ad M. 1681, Commentarius ad hist. æth. 1691. and Appendix ad hist.æth. 1693. All in fol. — *Maturin Veyssier la Croze* histoire du christianisme d'Ethiopie et d'Armenie. Haag. 1739. 8vo.

[3] *Clem. Galani* historia Armena eccl. et polit. from his Conciliatio eccl. Armenæ cum Rom. (Romæ 1651 – 61. 3 voll. fol.) vol. I. reprinted separately, Colon. 1686. 8vo. Francof. et Lips. 1701. 8vo. — *Le Quien* l. c. T. I. p. 1360 seq. *La Croze* l. c. Mémoires sur l'Armenie par St. Martin. Paris. 1828.

[4] *Assemani* Bibl. orient. T. II. — *Le Quien*, l. c. T. II.

§ 111.

SEMIPELAGIAN CONTROVERSY.

The Western churches were but little disturbed by the Monophysite controversy. On the other hand, the contest between the followers of Augustine and the Semipelagians still continued, especially in Gaul (see p. 227), though without leading to actual divisions in the church. At first the Semipelagians had so much the advantage that Faustus, who was the head of the party (first abbot of Lirinum, then bishop of Reii, † about the year 490), compelled a certain presbyter Lucidas, who had taught Augustine's doctrines, to retract;[1] and the Semipelagian principles were approved at the councils of Arelate and Lugdunum (A. D. 472–475).[2] We find them too expressed without disguise by Arnobius junior (about the year 461),[3] in his work entitled Predestinatus,[4] and by Gennadius, presbyter at Massilia († A. D. 495).[5]

The prejudice in Gaul against the system of Augustine was chiefly on account of the doctrine of the absolute decrees of God, which, in the form it had there assumed, distorted by the consequences drawn from it by its obstinate defenders on the one hand, and by its enemies on the other,[6] was plainly fatal to all morality.[7] Some indeed did

---

[1] cf. *Fausti* Rejensis epist. ad Lucidum presb. and *Lucidi* errorem emendantis libellus ad Episcopos, Mansi T. VII. p. 1008.

[2] Faustus' chief work *de gratia Dei et humanæ mentis libero arbitrio* libb. 2 (Bibl. Patr. Lugd. T. VIII. p. 525 seq.), was signed at the latter place.

[3] In his commentarius in Psalmos (Bibl. PP. Lugd. T. VIII. p. 238 seq.).

[4] Prim. ed. *J. Sirmond.* Paris. 1643. 8vo. (recus. in Bibl. PP. Lugd. T. XXVII. p. 543. Bibl. PP. Gallandii T. X. p. 357). The first book contains a short sketch of 90 heresies (the 90th that of the Prædestinatorum); the second a liber sub nomine Augustini confictus, and the third a refutation of this book. — It is possible that the whole may have been written by Arnobius, as is supposed by *Sirmond.* and the Benedictines histoire litéraire de la France T. II. p. 349.

[5] De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis, continuation of Jerome (in Biblioth. Eccl. J. A. Fabricii. Hamb. 1718): de fide s. de dogmatibus ecclesiasticis liber ad Gelasium Papam (ed *Elmenhorst.* Hamburg. 1614. 4to.).

[6] Lucidus was forced to condemn the following propositions: quod præscientia Dei hominem violenter compellat ad mortem, vel quod cum Dei pereant voluntate, qui pereunt. — alios deputatos ad mortem, alios ad vitam prædestinatos. The *Pseudo-Augustinus* in the Prædestinatus lib. II. says: Quem voluerit Deus sanctum esse, sanctus est, aliud non erit: quem præscierit esse iniquum, iniquus erit, aliud non erit. *Prædestinatio* enim Dei jam et numerum justorum, et numerum constituit peccatorum, et necesse erit constitutum terminum præteriri non posse. — De Deo Apostolus dicit: *Quos vocavit, hos prædestinavit* (Rom. viii. 30). Si præscientem et prædestinantem et vocantem in Apostolo legitis, nobis ut quid impingitis crimen ob hoc, quod dicimus, *prædestinasse Deum homines sive ad justitiam sive ad peccatum?* — Invictus enim in sua voluntate permanet Deus, cum homo adsidue superetur. Si ergo invictum confitemini Deum, confitemini et hoc, quia quod eos voluit ille, qui condidit, aliud esse non possunt. Unde colligimus apud animum, quia quos Deus semel prædestinavit ad vitam, etiamsi negligant, etiamsi peccent, etiamsi nolint, ad vitam perducentur inviti: quos autem

not scruple to attribute these errors directly to Augustine;[8] but for the most part it was usual to distinguish between Augustine himself and those who now taught his doctrines,[9] in order with the more security to condemn these last as heretics under the name of Predestinarians.[10]

In Rome and Africa, on the other hand, the doctrines of Augustine were strictly adhered to; and from this quarter burst forth a storm which threatened the utter extinction of Semipelagianism. Those same Scythian monks, who occasioned so much disturbance by their efforts to introduce the formula, "God was crucified" (see § 109, note 3), were also the bitter enemies of Pelagianism. Not satisfied with the decision of Hormisdas (patriarch of Rome) concerning Faustus,[11] they brought the question of his orthodoxy before the African bishops in Sardinia (A. D. 523); in whose name *Fulgentius*, bishop of Ruspe († A. D. 533), decided in favor of the doctrines of Augustine as opposed to Faustus.[12] In consequence of this, the

---

prædestinavit ad mortem, etiamsi currant, etiamsi festinent, sine causa laborant. Compare § 85, note 26.

[7] *Præfatio Prædestinati:* — Quis hanc fidem habens sacerdotum benedictionibus caput inclinare desideret, et eorum sibi precibus et sacrificiis credat posse succurri? Si enim hæc nec prodesse volentibus, nec obesse nolentibus incipiant credi, cessabunt omnia Dei sacerdotum studia, et universa monitorum adminicula vana videbuntur esse figmenta: atque ita unusquisque suis erit vitiis occupatus, ut criminum suorum delectationum Dei prædestinationem existimet, et ad bonum a malo transitum, nec per sacerdotum Dei (studia?), nec per conversionem suam, nec per legem dominicam se posse invenire confidat.

[8] Faustus only alludes to him, *de grat. Dei et hum. ment*, 1. *arb.* I. 4: si ergo unus ad vitam, alter ad perditionem, ut asserunt, deputatus est, *sicut quidam Sanctorum dixit*, non judicandi nascimur, sed judicati. *Ibid.* c. 11: igitur dum *liberi interemtor arbitrii* in alterutram partem omnia ex prædestinatione statuta et definita esse pronunciat, etc. *Gennadius de script. eccl.* c. 38, speaking of Augustine: Quis tanto studio legat, quanto ille scripsit? Unde et multa loquenti accidit, quod dixit per Salomonem Spir. S.: *In multiloquio non effugies peccatum* (Prov. x. 19). — Error tamen illius sermone multo, ut dixi, contractus, lucta hostium exaggeratus, necdum hæresis quæstionem dedit.

[9] So especially *Prædestinatus.* In the præf.: Silerem: — si non etiam audacter sub Augustini nomine libros ederent. — Quis enim nesciat, Augustinum orthodoxum semper fuisse doctorem, et tam scribendo quam disputando omnibus hæreticis obviasse?

[10] Violent controversy in the 17th century, on the question, whether there ever was any particular sect of Predestinarians. The Jesuits (especially *J. Sirmond* historia Prædestinatiana, Paris. 1648. in Ej. opp. T. IV., and in *Gallandii* Bibl. PP. T. X. p. 401 seq.) and the earlier Lutherans in the affirmative, the Jansenists (especially *G. Mauguin* accurata historiæ Prædestinatianæ J. Sirmondi confutatio, in his vindiciis prædestinationis et gratiæ, p. 443 seq.), the Dominicans, and the Calvinists on the other side. With the last the more modern historians agree (compare Semler in the hist. introd. to the 3d part of Baumgarten's Polemik, S. 312). — Compare *Sagittarii* introd. in hist. eccl. T. I. p. 1148 seq. Walch's Ketzerhist. Th. 5. S. 218 ff.

[11] *Horm.* epist. ad Possessorem and Jo. Maxentii ad ep. Horm. responsio (see § 109, note 3).

[12] Epistola Synodica Episc. Afric. in Sardinia exulum ad Jo. Maxentium, etc. Mansi T. VIII. p. 591 seq. — *Fulgentii Ruspensis* libb. III. de veritate prædestinationis et gratia dei (his libb. VII. adv. Faustum) together with his other works (libb III. ad Monimum — several works against Arians, and others of a dogmatic character) ed. Paris. 1684. 4to. in Bibl. PP. Ludg. IX. p. 16 seq.

Semipelagian system was formally condemned in Gaul also, at the council of Arausio (A. D. 529),[13] though without any especial mention of individuals.[14]

§ 112.

HISTORY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SCIENCES.

The Roman empire was now overrun by barbarians, the minds of men were no longer roused to activity by the necessity of struggling against paganism, the study of the so-called heathen sciences was looked upon with suspicious eyes, especially by the monks; add to this the new trammels which the church was continually laying on free enquiry, and the almost exclusive attention to a few barren points of dispute, and we cannot wonder that all true learning should have fallen more and more into neglect amongst Christians.[1]

The writers who were engaged in the various controversies have already been named. In the Western church *Faustus* of Reii (p. 328), *Fulgentius Ruspensis* (p. 329), *Fulgentius Ferrandus*, *Facundus Hermianensis*, and *Liberatus* (p. 326 seq.): and in the Eastern *Leontius* of Byzantium (p. 315), and *John Philoponus* (p. 321). Also the ecclesiastical historians *Basilius Cilix*, *Zacharias Rhetor* (p. 314), *Theodorus Lector*, and *Evagrius Scholasticus* (p. 177).

In the West the Chronicon of Jerome had inspired a taste for such works, and there were many continuations of it; of which the most remarkable was by Prosper Aquitanus to the year 455 (p. 227), and after that by Victor Tununensis to A. D. 566 (p. 327).

Jerome's work, De Scriptoribus Ecclesiæ, was continued by *Gennadius* of Massilia (p. 328), and further by *Isidorus Hispalensis*.

There was now less and less of independent investigation; and instead of it men were content to compile from the works of the church fathers. In the department of biblical criticism we have now a series of the so-called Catenists,[2] beginning with Procopius Gazaeus in the East

---

[13] Vid. the 25 capitula of the Synod, Mansi, T. VIII. p. 711 seq. — Cap. 25 is directed against a consequence which had been falsely drawn from the system of Augustine: Aliquos vero ad malum divina potestate prædestinatos esse non solum non credimus, sed etiam, si sunt qui tantum malum credere velint, cum omni detestatione illis anathema dicimus.

[14] Hence Faustus is still honored in Provence as a saint, which is, to be sure, censured by some (e. g. Baronius ad ann. 490, § 42), but by others defended. Compare *J. Stilting* de S. Fausto comm. hist. in *Actis* SS. Sept. vol. VII. p. 651 seq.

[1] Bossuets Weltgeschichte fortg. v. J. A. Cramer, Th. 5. Bd. 2. S. 52 ff. L. Wachlers Handbuch der Geschichte der Literatur. Th. 2. (Zweite Umarbeit. Frankf. a. M. 1823) S. 5 ff. Münschers Dogmengeschichte, Bd. 3. S. 44 ff.

[2] *J. F. S. Augustin.* de catenis PP. græc. in N. T. observationes. Halæ. 1762. (in *J. A. Nœsselti* III. commentatt. ad hist. eccl. pertinent. Halæ. 1817. 8vo. p. 321 seq.).

(about the year 520),[3] and Primasius, bishop of Adrumetum in the West (about the year 550).[4] The writings of Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus († A. D. 562 or later),[5] and those of Isidore, bishop of Hispalis († A. D. 636),[6] are likewise little more than compilations. In the χριστιανικὴ τοπογραφία (Christian topography) of Cosmas Indicopleustes (about the year 535),[7] we have a remarkable instance of the influence of theological views on the other sciences.

Distinguished as an independent thinker, in this age of imitation and authorities, was the philosopher A. M. T. S. Boethius († A. D. 525), a follower of Aristotle:[8] though in his philosophical writings he refers so little to Christianity, that one is led to doubt, not only if he could have been the author of the theological works ascribed to him,[9] but even if he could have been a Christian.[10]

There were now but few institutions any where for the advancement of theological learning, and in the West none at all.[11] The

---

[3] Comm. in Octateuchum, in Esaiam, Proverbia, in XII Proph. minores, etc. cf. *Fabricii Bibl. gr.* vol. V. p. 259 (*ed. Harles*, vol. VII. p. 563). *Augustin.* l. c. § XII. p. 385.

[4] Comm. in epistolas Pauli.

[5] Comment. in Psalmos compiled from Augustine, Historia eccles. tripartita in 12 Books (see authorities prefixed to § 73). — Institutio ad divinas lectiones libb. II. Historically important are his Variæ Epistolæ libb. XII. Of his de rebus gestis Gothorum libb. XII. there remains only the extract by Jornandes, bishop of Ravenna, A. D. 552. His book de VII disciplinis was much used in the middle ages. — Opp. ed. *J. Garetius.* Rothomagi 1679. (Venet. 1729.) 2 voll. fol. *La vie de Cassiodore par F. D. de Ste. Marthe. Paris.* 1694. 12mo. Cassiodor von Staudlin; im Kirchenhist. Archive für 1825. S. 259 ff., and 381 ff.

[6] Comm. in libros hist. Vet. Test. — De ecclesiasticis officiis libb. II. — Sententiarum s. de summo bono libb. III. (important for the middle ages. Sententiarii) — Regula Monachorum — de scriptoribus eccles. — and many others. The chief work Originum s. Etymologiarum libb. XX. — Hist. Gothorum, Vandalorum et Suevorum in Hispania. — Opp. ed. *J. Grial.* Madr. 1599. (Paris. 1601. Colon. 1617) fol. *Faust. Arevalo.* Romæ 1797. VII. voll. 4to.

[7] Prim. ed. *B. de Montfaucon in Collect. nov. PP. Græc.* T. II. (Paris. 1706): recus. in *Gallandii Bibl. PP.* T. XI. p. 401 seq. cf. *Semler hist. eccl. selecta capita* I. p. 421 seq.

[8] His chief work: de consolatione Philosophiæ libb. V. Besides this, translations from the writings of Porphyry and Aristotle, and commentaries to the same. The love of Aristotle began with him in the West, as with John Philoponus in the East (see § 109, note 14).

[9] Adv. Eutychen et Nestor. de duabus naturis et una persona Christi. — Quod Trinitas sit unus Deus et non tres dii ad Symmachum. — Utrum Pater, Filius et Sp. S. de divinitate substantialiter prædicentur.

[10] His works were much used in the schools of the middle ages, and in the 8th century he was even enrolled amongst the saints, and a day dedicated to him, in conjunction with two other *Severini*, on the 23d Oct. Gottf. Arnold (Unparth. Kirch. u. Ketzergesch. Th. 1. B. 6. Cap. 3. § 7. On the other side *J. C. Wolfii disp. Carcer eruditorum museum)*, and Ersch and Gruber's Encyclop. Bd. 11. S. 283 ff. maintain that he was not a Christian.

[11] *Cassiodor. de inst. div. lit. præf.:* Cum studia sæcularium literarum magno desiderio fervere cognoscerem (compare Sartorius Versuch über die Regierung der Ostgothen während ihrer Herrschaft in Italien. Hamburg, 1811. S. 152 ff. Manso Gesch. des ostgoth. Reichs in Italien. Breslau 1824. S. 132) ita ut multa pars hominum per ipsa se mundi prudentiam crederet adipisci; gravissimo

monkish contempt displayed by Gregory the Great[12] for the liberal arts contributed no doubt to the daily increasing neglect of them,[13] though the later traditions of his utter hostility to all literature are certainly much exaggerated.[14]

---

sum (fateor) dolore permotus, quod scripturis divinis magistris publici deessent, cum mundani auctores celeberrima procul dubio traditione pollerent. Nisus sum ergo cum b. Agapito Papa urbis Romæ, ut sicut apud Alexandriam multo tempore fuisse traditur institutum, nunc etiam in Nisibi civitate Syrorum ab Hæbræis sedulo fertur exponi, collatis expensis in urbe Romana professos Doctores scholæ potius acciperent Christianæ, unde et anima susciperet æternam salutem, et casto atque purissimo eloquio fidelium lingua comeretur. Sed cum per bella ferventia et turbulenta nimis in Italico regno certamina desiderium meum nullatenus valuisset impleri: quoniam non habet locum res pacis temporibus inquietis; ad hoc divina caritate probor esse compulsus, ut ad vicem magistri introductorios vobis libros istos, Domino præstante, conficerem, etc. What substitute was adopted may be seen from *Conc. Vasense* III. ann. 529. can. 1: Hoc enim placuit, ut omnes presbyteri, qui sunt in parochiis constituti, secundum consuetudinem, quam per totam Italiam satis salubriter teneri cognovimus, juniores lectores — secum in domo — recipiant: et eos — psalmos parare, divinis lectionibus insistere, et in lege domini erudire contendant: ut sibi dignos successores provideant.

[12] *Pauli Warnefridi* (about A. D. 775) *de vita S. Gregor. Papæ* libb. IV. (prim. ed. Jo. Mabillon in the Annales Ord. S. Bened. Sæc. I. p. 383) and *Johannis Eccl. Rom. Diaconi* (about A. D. 875) *vita S. Greg.* libb. IV. both in Tom. IV. of the Benedictine ed. of Gregory's works. — Gregory's most important works: Expositionis in Job. s. Moralium libb. XXXV.—Liber pastoralis curæ ad Joh. Ravennæ Episc. (by Anastasius Sinaita Patriarch of Antioch, immediately translated into Greek). — Dialogorum de vita et miraculis Patrum Ital. et de æternitate animarum libb. IV. (translated into Greek about A. D. 744, by Zacharias). — Epistolarum libb. XIV. (according to the more ancient arrangement libb. XII.). — Liber Sacramentorum de circulo anni s. Sacramentarium. — Antiphonarius s. Gradualis liber. — *Opp. ed. Petr. Gussanvillæus.* voll. III. Paris. 1675. fol. *studio et labore Monachorum Ord. S. Bened. e. Congr. S. Mauri* voll. IV. Paris. 1705. fol. *locupletata a J. B. Galliccioli. Venet.* 1768 seq. voll. XVII. 4to. Concerning the more modern abbreviators of Gregory, see *Oudinus de scriptt. eccl. ant.* vol. I. p. 1544.

[13] e. g. in the *Epistola ad Leandrum*, prefixed to his Exposit. libri Jobi: Non barbarismi confusionem devito, situs motusque præpositionum casusque servare contemno, quia indignum vehementer existimo, ut verba cœlestis oraculi restringam sub regulis Donati. — Lib. XI. Epist. 54, ad Desiderium, Episc. Viennensem: pervenit ad nos, quod sine verecundia memorare non possumus, Fraternitatem tuam grammaticam quibusdam exponere. Quam rem ita moleste suscepimus, ac sumus vehementius aspernati, ut ea, quæ prius dicta fuerant, in gemitus et tristitiam verteremus: quia in uno se ore cum Jovis laudibus Christi laudes non capiunt, etc.

[14] *Joannes Sarisburiensis* (about A. D. 1172) in his *Polycraticus*, lib. II. c. 26: Doctor sanctus ille Gregorius — non modo Matthesin jussit ab aula, sed, ut traditur a majoribus, incendio dedit probatæ lectionis scripta, Palatinus quæcunque recepit Apollo. Lib. VIII. c. 19, fertur b. Gregorius bibliothecam combussisse gentilem, quo divinæ paginæ gratior esset locus, et major auctoritas, et diligentia studiosior. *Barthol. Platina* (about A. D. 1480) *de vitis Pontificum, in vita Gregorii:* Neque est cur patiamur Gregorium hac in re a quibusdam — carpi, quod suo mandato veterum ædificia sint dirupta, ne peregrini et advenæ — posthabitis locis sacris, arcus triumphales et monumenta veterum cum admiratione inspicerent. Platina tries to defend him from the charge. *Id. in vita Sabiniani:* Paululum etiam abfuit, quin libri ejus (Gregorii) comburerentur, adeo in Gregorium ira et invidia exarserat homo malevolus. Sunt qui scribant, Sabinianum instigantibus quibusdam Romanis hoc in Gregorium molitum esse, quod veterum statuas tota urbe, dum viveret, et obtruncaverit et disjecerit, quod quidem ita vero dissonum est, ut illud, quod de abolendis ædificiis majorum in vita ejus diximus. Against the credibility of these stories, see *P. Bayle Dictionnaire hist. et crit.*

A new field of industry was now opened to theologians in making digests of the multiplied ecclesiastical laws, and arranging them more conveniently.[15]

In the Greek church[16] the canons had been arranged in the order of the subjects, instead of the old chronological order, very soon after the council of Chalcedon. The oldest collection of this kind now extant is that of John Scholasticus of Antioch (afterwards patriarch of Constantinople, † A. D. 578),[17] who, in another work, entitled the Nomocanon,[18] collected also the parallel laws passed by the emperors.

In the Latin church there was not even a tolerably complete chronological collection of the canons until that made after the council of Chalcedon, since known as the *Prisca translatio.*[19] A still fuller collection was afterwards made by Dionysius *exiguus* (about the year 510),[20] in a better translation, to which was added a collection of the papal decrees. In Spain there had very early been a collection of the decrees of the synods, which was by degrees enlarged, and, on the model of that by Dionysius, a collection of papal decrees added. This was afterwards known as the collection of Isidore, archbishop of Hierapolis († A. D. 636), who was chiefly concerned in the work.[21]

The laws concerning penance had gradually become so numerous, that it was necessary to reduce them to a separate code. This was done by Johannes *jejunator*, patriarch of Constantinople from A. D. 585 – 595, who wrote the *Ἀκολουθία καὶ τάξις ἐπὶ ἐξομολογουμένων*,[22] the first libellus pœnitentialis (rules of penance).

Art. *Gregoire*, not. H. and M. *Jo. Barbeyrac* de la morale des Peres, c. 17. § 16. What *Brucker*, *hist. crit.* T. III. p. 560, says on the other side is quite unsatisfactory.

[15] *A. Gallandii de vetustis canonum collectionibus dissertationum sylloge* (Dissertations of Coustant, de Marca, den Ballerini, Berard, Quesnell, sc.) *Venetiis* 1778. fol. recus. *Moguntiasi* 1790. T. II. 4to. (L. T. Spittlers) Geschichte des canonischen Rechts bis auf die Zeiten des falschen Isidorus. Halle, 1778. 8vo.

[16] *Jos. Sim. Assemani Bibliotheca juris orientalis, civilis et canonici.* Romæ 1762 – 66. T. V. 4to. (incomplete, containing only the Codex canonum eccl. Græcæ, and the Codex juris civilis eccl. Græcæ). *F. A. Biener de collectionibus canonum Eccl. Græcæ schediasma litterarium. Berol.* 1827. 8vo.

[17] Also found in *Guil. Vœlli* et *H. Justelli* bibliotheca juris canonici veteris (T. II. Paris. 1661. fol.), T. II. p. 499 seq.

[18] The same, p. 603 seq. Compare F. A. Bieners Gesch. de Novellen Justinians. Berlin, 1824. 8vo. S. 194 ff.

[19] Best ed. that of the Ballerini opp. Leonis T. III. p. 473 seq., from which *Mansi* T. VI. p. 1105 seq. Concerning it, see Ballerini de ant. collectionibus canonum (prefixed to T. III. Opp. Leonis, and in Gallandii sylloge), P. II. cap. 2. § 3. Spittler, l. c. S. 129.

[20] *Ballerini*, l. c. P. III. cap. 1 – 3. Spittler, S. 134.

[21] *Ballerini*, l. c. P. II. cap. II. § 2; P. III. c. 4. Spittler, S. 191 ff.

[22] Afterwards much interpolated, ed. in *J. Morini comm. hist. de disciplina in administratione Sacramenti Pœnitentiæ.* Paris. 1651. fol. *in Append.*

CHAPTER THIRD.

HISTORY OF THE HIERARCHY.

§ 113.

PRIVILEGES OF THE CLERGY.

The clergy, and in particular the bishops, received new privileges from Justinian. To the bishops was intrusted the civil jurisdiction over the monks and nuns, as well as the clergy.[1] The superintendence of the public morals, and especially the duty of providing for the unfortunate (see § 89), which had hitherto been founded only in ecclesiastical laws, were now sanctioned by the civil law. Justinian made it their duty, and lawfully empowered them, to interfere in behalf of all prisoners, minors, insane persons, foundlings, stolen children, and oppressed women;[2] invested them with certain rights for the upholding of good morals,[3] and the impartial administration of justice;[4] and empowered them to resist the oppressive measures of the Præsides provinc., and take part in the administration of the public property.[5] Thus the bishops became very important personages in civil as well as ecclesiastical life, and were farther honored by Justinian in being freed from parental authority,[6] from the necessity of appearing as witnesses, and from taking oaths.[7]

Heraclius, finally, committed to the bishops the jurisdiction over the clergy in criminal cases also.[8]

---

[1] Novellæ Justin. 79 et 83 (both A. D. 539). More particular, Nov. 123. cap. 21: Si quis autem litigantium intra X dies contradicat iis, quæ judicata sunt, tunc locorum judex causam examinet. — Si judicis sententia contraria fuerit iis, quæ a Deo amabili Episcopo judicata sunt: tunc locum habere appellationem contra sententiam judicis. — Si vero crimen fuerit, quod adversus quamlibet memoratarum reverendissimarum personarum inferatur — judex ultionem ei inferat legibus congruentem. Further, in a criminal accusation: Si episcopus distulerit judicare, licentiam habeat actor civilem judicem adire. cf. *B. Schilling de origine jurisdictionis eccles. in causis civilibus. Lips.* 1825. 4to. p. 41 seq.

[2] *Cod. Justin.* Lib. I. Tit. IV. *de Episcopali audientia* (i. e. judicio) L. 22. — L. 30. — L. 27. — L. 28. — L. 24. — L. 33.

[3] Ibid. L. 25.

[4] Ibid. L. 21. L. 31.

[5] Ibid. L. 26.

[6] Novell. 81.

[7] Novell. 123. c. 7.

[8] The *Constitutiones Imperatoriæ* (annexed to the *Cod. Justin.*) give the substance of an edict of Heraclius (reigned from 610 – 641) as follows, *μήτε ἐπίσκοπον, μήτε κληρικὸν, μήτε μοναχὸν, χρηματικῆς ἢ ἐγκληματικῆς χάριν αἰτίας παρὰ πολιτικῷ ἢ στρατιωτικῷ ἐνάγεσθαι ἄρχοντι· ἀλλὰ παρὰ μόνοις τοῖς ἰδίοις ἐπισκόποις, ἢ μητροπολίταις, ἢ πατριάρχαις.* — found complete in J. Leunclavii Juris Græco Romani. Francof. 1596. fol., and in Voelli et Justelli Bibl. juris. can. T. II. p. 1361.

§ 114.

DEPENDENCE OF THE HIERARCHY ON THE STATE.

Notwithstanding these great privileges, the hierarchy became more and more dependent on the state. The emperors sent their ecclesiastical laws to be promulgated by the patriarchs, as they did their civil laws to the Prætorian prefects.[1] Their right to do this was unquestioned, as long as they confined themselves to the external relations of the church, or even subjects connected with its internal government;[2] but hardly so when they began to decide questions of faith by edicts, and to assemble synods only to adopt articles which they had prescribed. The Greek bishops indeed became more and more confirmed in the habit of sacrificing their convictions to their interest;[3] but the bishops of the Latin church, favored by the political condition of their country, were more successful in preserving their independence.

§ 115.

HISTORY OF THE PATRIARCHS.

Ever since the beginning of the Monophysite controversy, the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch had been growing more and

---

[1] F. A. Biener s Gesch. der Novellen Justinians. Berlin, 1824. S. 31. Compare S. 25 ff.

[2] Biener, l. c. S. 157 ff.; 161 ff. Thus Justinianus in *Nov.* 123. c. 3, where he fixes the amount to be given by the bishops pro inthronisticis, uses the expression: Κελεύομεν τοίνυν τοὺς μὲν μακαριωτάτους ἀρχιεπισκόπους καὶ πατριάρχας, τουτέστι τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης καὶ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, καὶ Ἀλεξανδρείας, καὶ Θεουπόλεως, καὶ Ἱεροσολύμων. The emperor Mauricius having made a law, ut quisquis publicis administrationibus fuerit implicatus, ei neque ad ecclesiasticum officium venire, neque in monasterium converti liceat: *Gregorius M.* Lib. III. *Ep* 65 *ad Mauricium Aug.* remonstrated against the 2d part of the prohibition. e. g. Ego vero hæc Dominis meis loquens, quid sum nisi pulvis et vermis? Sed tamen quia contra auctorem omnium Deum hanc intendere constitutionem sentio, Dominis tacere non possum. — Ad hæc ecce per me servum ultimum suum et vestrum respondebit Christus dicens: Ego te de notario comitem excubitorum, de comite excubitorum Cæsarem, de Cæsare Imperatorem, nec solum hoc, sed etiam patrem Imperatorum feci. *Sacerdotes meos tuæ manui commisi*, et tu a meo servitio milites tuos subtrahis? Responde, rogo piissime Domine, servo tuo, quid venienti et hæc dicenti responsurus es in judicio Domino tuo? — *Ego quidem jussioni subjectus eandem legem per diversas terrarum partes transmitti feci: et quia lex ipsa omnipotenti Deo minime concordat, ecce per suggestionis meæ paginam serenissimis Dominis nuntiavi. Utrobique ergo quæ debui exsolvi, qui et Imperatori obedientiam præbui, et pro Deo quod sensi minime tacui.*

[3] *Epistola Legatis Francorum, qui Constantinopolim proficiscebantur, ab Italiæ clericis directa* A. D. 551, *Mansi* IX. p. 153: Sunt Græci episcopi habentes divites et opulentas ecclesias, et non patiuntur duos menses a rerum ecclesiasticarum dominatione suspendi: pro qua re secundum tempus, et secundum voluntatem principum, quidquid ab eis quæsitum fuerit, sine altercatione consentiunt.

more insignificant. Only the patriarch of Constantinople, upheld by the privileges granted him at the council of Chalcedon,[1] could now pretend to vie with the Roman hierarch.[2] But whilst the one was dependent on imperial caprice, and constantly harassed by the spirit of controversy, by which the East was so eminently distinguished, the other enjoyed the most perfect freedom in ecclesiastical matters, and the great advantage of standing at the head of a less excitable and therefore more united clergy.[3] After the fall of the Western empire (A. D. 476) [by which, however, they had never been molested but often furthered],[4] the Roman bishops became subject to German princes, and were left in perfect freedom to conduct all affairs within the church according to their own pleasure. This was particularly the case under Theoderich, king of the Arian Ostrogoths (A. D. 494 – 526),[5] who was well satisfied with the schism between Rome and Constantinople, since it insured him from all combinations of the hierarchy in political matters. On the death of the bishop Anastasius, there ensued a contested election between Symmachus and Laurentius (A. D. 498). Theoderich remained entirely passive until both parties called on him to interfere,[6] and then quietly allowed a Roman synod under Symmachus (A. D. 502),[7] to declare all interference of the laity in the affairs of the Roman church wholly inadmissible.[8]

---

[1] Under Basiliscus, the predominant Monophysite party suspended these privileges partially. *Evagrius* III. 6: (Timotheus Ælurus) ἀποδίδωσι τῇ Ἐφεσίων καὶ τὸ πατριαρχικὸν δίκαιον ὅπερ αὐτὴν ἀφεῖλεν ἡ ἐν Χαλκηδόνι σύνοδος: by the law, *Cod. Justin.* I. 2, 16, however (by Zeno, and not according to the title by Leo) the decrees of Chalcedon were revived.

[2] Order of the bishops of Rome: Leo I. the Great † 461, Hilarius † 468, Simplicius † 483, Felix II. † 492, Gelasius I. † 496, Anastasius II. † 498, Symmachus † 514, Hormisdas † 523, John I. † 526, Felix III. † 530, Boniface II. † 532, John II. 535, Agapetus I. † 536, Silberius, banished by Belisarius, 537, Vigilius † 555, Pelagius I. † 560, John III. † 573, Benedict I. † 578, Pelagius II. † 590, Gregory I. the Great † 604, Sabinianus † 606, Boniface III. † 607, Boniface IV. † 615, Deusdedit † 618, Boniface V. † 625.

[3] See § 92.

[4] See § 92.

[5] On the course pursued by the Ostrogoth kings towards the church, see G. Sartorius Versuch über die Regierung der Ostgothen während ihrer Herrschaft in Italien. Hamburg. 1811. S. 124 ff. 306 ff. J. C. F. Manso Gesch. des ostgoth. Reichs in Italien, Breslau, 1824. S. 141 ff. Theoderich says (*Cassiodori Variarum* Lib. II. *Ep.* 27): Religionem imperare non possumus: quia nemo cogitur, ut credat invitus. King Theodahat to the Emperor Justinian (Ibid. X. Ep. 26): Cum divinitas diversas patiatur religiones esse, nos unam non audemus imponere. Retinemus enim legisse nos, voluntarie sacrificandum esse Domino, non cujusquam cogentis imperio. Quod qui aliter facere tentaverit, evidenter cœlestibus jussionibus obviavit.

[6] According to *Theodorus Lector* lib. II. (ed. Vales. Amstelod. p. 560) Laurentius was chosen by the imperial party on the condition of signing the Henoticon. cf. *Anastasii Lib. Pontificalis* c. 52 in vita Symmachi.

[7] *Synodus Romana* III. *sub Symmacho*, in the Collections cited erroneously as the *Syn. Rom.* IV. s. *Palmaris*, vid. *Pagi ad ann.* 502 *num.* 3 seq.

[8] The Acta of this Council in *Mansi* VIII. p. 266 seq. The Protocol of a Synod held after the death of Pope Simplicius was read, and the decrees passed

Thus the Roman bishops were so far from being hindered, by any superior power, in their resistance to the innovations of the Greek church, that it only secured to them more firmly the favor of their new masters; and by perseverance in this course they at length gained a new victory over the changeable Greeks, in the reign of Justin I. (see § 108). The natural consequence of this was, that whilst the bishops of Constantinople were constantly losing ground by their vacillation and changes of opinion, the Roman bishops were still esteemed, as of old, the champions of orthodoxy.[9]

Under these circumstances, the Roman bishops met with no check in the career of their ecclesiastical ambition. They claimed not only the highest ecclesiastical authority in the West, but the superintendence of the true church every where. These claims they sometimes founded on imperial edicts[10] and the decrees of synods,[11] but for the

---

at it declared nugatory, as proceeding from a layman. This Protocol is given in the Acta just cited, as follows: Cum in unum apud b. Petrum Apostolum resedissent, sublimis et eminentissimus vir, præfectus prætorio atque patricius, agens etiam vices præcellentissimi regis Odoacris, Basilius dixit: Quamquam studio nostri et religionis intersit, ut in episcopatus electione concordia principaliter servetur ecclesiæ, ne per occasionem seditionis status civitatis vocetur in dubium: tamen admonitione beatissimi Papæ nostri Simplicii, quam ante oculos semper habere debemus, hoc nobis meministis sub obtestatione fuisse mandatum, ut propter illum strepitum, et venerabilis ecclesiæ detrimentum, si eum de hac luce transire contigerit, non sine nostra consultatione cujuslibet celebretur electio. Nam et cum quid confusionis atque dispendii venerabilis ecclesia sustineret: miramur prætermissis nobis quidquam fuisse tentatum, cum etiam sacerdote nostro superstite nihil sine nobis debuisset assumi. Quare si amplitudini vestræ vel sanctitati placet, incolumia omnia, quæ ad futuri antistitis electionem respiciunt, religiosa honoratione servemus, hanc legem specialiter præferentes, quam nobis hæredibusque nostris Christianæ mentis devotione sancimus: Ne unquam prædium, seu rusticum, seu urbanum, vel ornamenta aut ministeria ecclesiarum — ab eo qui nunc antistes sub electione communi fuerit ordinandus, et illis qui futuris sæculis sequentur, quocumque titulo atque commento alienentur. Si quis vero aliquid eorum alienare voluerit, inefficax atque irritum judicetur; sitque facienti vel consentienti, accipientique anathema, etc. On this provision it was decreed by the Synod under Symmachus: Perpendat s. Synodus, uti prætermissis personis religiosis, quibus Maxime cura est de tanto pontifice, electionem laici in suam redegerint potestatem, quod contra canones esse manifestum est. — Scriptura evidentissimis documentis constat invalida. Primum quod contra patrum regulas a laicis, quamvis religiosis, quibus nulla de ecclesiasticis facultatibus aliquid disponendi legitur unquam attributa facultas, facta videtur. Deinde quod nullius præsulis apostolicæ sedis subscriptione firmata docetur.

[9] *Cod. Just.* I. 1, 7, see note 23.

[10] *Hilarii P. Epist.* XI. (*Mansi* VII. p. 939): Fratri enim nostro Leontio nihil constituti a sanctæ memoriæ decessore meo juris potuit abrogari: — quia Christianorum quoque principum lege decretum est, ut quidquid ecclesiis earumque rectoribus — apostolicæ sedis antistes suo pronunciasset examine, veneranter accipi tenaciterque servari, cum suis plebibus caritas vestra cognosceret: nec unquam possent convelli, quæ et sacerdotali ecclesiastica præceptione fulcirentur et regia.

[11] *Epist. Synod. Rom. ad Clericos et Monachos Orient.* A. D. 485 (*Mansi* VII. p. 1140): Quotiens intra Italiam propter ecclesiasticas causas, præcipue fidei, colliguntur domini sacerdotes, consuetudo retinetur, ut successor præsulum sedis apostolicæ ex persona cunctorum totius Italiæ sacerdotum, juxta solicitudinem sibi ecclesiarum omnium competentem cuncta constituat, qui caput est omnium; domino ad b. Petrum dicente: *Tu es Petrus*, etc. Quam vocem sequentes

most part on the peculiar rights with which they supposed the apostle Peter to have been invested.[12] About this time the Synodus Palmaris (A. D. 503) was called together by Theoderich, to consider the new charges brought against Symmachus by the party of his rival (see note 6, above), and acquitted him without examination.[13] It

---

CCCXVIII sancti patres apud Nicæam congregati confirmationem rerum atque auctoritatem sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ detulerunt (comp. § 92 note 19, 25, 47): quam utramque usque ad ætatem nostram successiones omnes, Christi gratia præstante, custodiunt. *Gelasii Ep.* IV. *ad Faustum (Mansi* VIII. p. 19): Quantum ad religionem pertinet, nonnisi apostolicæ sedi juxta canones debetur summa judicii totius. *Ejusd. Ep.* XIII. *ad Episc. Dardaniæ (Mansi* VIII. p. 54) Non reticemus autem, quod cuncta per mundum novit ecclesia, quoniam quorumlibet sententiis ligata pontificum, sedes b. Petri Apostoli jus habeat resolvendi, utpote quod de omni ecclesia fas habeat judicandi, neque cuiquam de ejus liceat judicare judicio, siquidem ad illam de qualibet mundi parte canones appellari voluerint, ab illa autem nemo sit appellare permissus.

[12] *Gelasii decretum de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis (Mansi* VIII. p. 157): quamvis universæ per orbem catholicæ diffusæ ecclesiæ unus thalamus Christi sit, sancta tamen Romana ecclesia nullis synodicis constitutis cæteris ecclesiis prælata est, sed evangelica voce Domini et Salvatoris nostri primatum obtinuit: *Tu es Petrus*, etc. Cui data est etiam societas b. Pauli Apostoli, — qui non diverso, sicut hæretici garriunt, sed uno tempore, uno eodemque die gloriosa morte cum Petro in urbe Roma sub Cæsare Nerone agonizans, coronatus est. Et pariter supradictam s. Romanam ecclesiam Christo domino consecrarunt, aliisque omnibus in universo mundo sua presentia atque venerando triumpho prætulerunt. *(Gregorii M.* lib. IV. in 1 *Reg.* 5, *ed. Bened.* T. III. P. II. p. 250: Saulus ad Christum conversus caput effectus est nationum, quia obtinuit totius ecclesiæ principatum, comp. § 92, note 27.)

[13] *Syn. Rom.* IV. *sub Symmacho s. Palmaris*, erroneously cited as *Syn.* III. vid. *Pagi ad ann.* 503 *num.* 2, seq. *C. L. Nitzschii disp. de Synodo Palmari. Viteberg.* 1775 (reprinted in *Pottii sylloge commentt. theoll.* vol. IV. p. 67 seq). — The Acta in *Mansi* VIII. p. 247 seq. Symmachus having been in danger of his life at the Synod, declares to them *(Relatio Episcopp. ad Regem*, p. 256): Primum ad conventum vestrum — sine aliqua dubitatione properavi, et privilegia mea voluntati regiæ submisi, et auctoritatem synodi dedi: sicut habet ecclesiastica disciplina, restaurationem ecclesiarum regulariter proposci: sed nullus mihi a vobis effectus est. Deinde cum venirem cum clero meo, crudeliter mactatus sum. Ulterius me vestro examini non committo: in potestate Dei est, et domini regis, quid de me deliberet ordinare (comp. § 90, note 12) The Synod having reported this to the king, he answered (l. c. p. 257): miramur denuo fuisse consultum: cum si nos de præsenti ante voluissemus judicare negotio, habito cum proceribus nostris de inquirenda veritate tractatu, Deo auspice, potuissemus invenire justitiam, quæ nec præsenti sæculo, nec futuræ forsitan displicere potuisset ætati. — Nunc vero eadem, quæ dudum, præsentibus intimamus oraculis. — Sive discussa, sive indiscussa causa, proferte sententiam, de qua estis rationem divino judicio reddituri: dummodo, sicuti sæpe diximus, hæc deliberatio vestra provideat, ut pax Senatui populoque Romano, submota omni confusione, reddatur. For the further proceedings of the Synod see their Protocol, p. 250: Dei mandata complentes Italiæ suum dedimus rectorem, agnoscentes nullum nobis laborem alium remansisse, nisi ut dissidentes cum humilitate propositi nostri ad concordiam hortaremur. After saying quanta inconvenienter et præjudicialiter in hujus negotii principio contigissent: maxime cum illa quæ præmisimus inter alia de auctoritate sedis obstarent: quia quod possessor ejus quondam b. Petrus meruit, in nobilitatem possessionis accessit: — maxime cum omnem pene plebem cernamus ejus communioni indissociabiliter adhæsisse: they conclude: ut Symmachus Papa sedis apostolicæ præsul, ab hujusmodi propositionibus impetitus, quantum ad homines respicit (quia totum causis obsistentibus superius designatis constat arbitrio divino fuisse dimissum) sit immunis et liber. — Unde secundum principalia præcepta, quæ nostræ hoc tribuunt potestati, ei, quidquid ecclesiastici intra sacram urbem

was on this occasion that Ennodius, bishop of Ticinum (A. D. 511), writing in defence of this synod, first hazarded the assertion that the bishop of Rome was subject to no earthly tribunal.[14] Not long after, an attempt was made to give this principle a historical basis by bringing forward forged gesta [acts] of former popes;[15] nor was this the only instance of the like deception.[16] Still the Roman bishops themselves (or, as they were already called in contradistinction from all others in the West, the *Papæ* or *Popes*),[17] did not as yet claim any other honors than were paid to all apostolical sees,[18] acknowledging

---

Romam vel foris juris est, reformamus, totamque causam Dei judicio reservantes, etc.

[14] *Magni Felicis Ennodii* (Opp. ed. J. Sirmond. Paris. 1611. recusa in Gallandii Bibl. PP. XI. pag. 47 seq.) *Libellus apologeticus pro Synodo* IV. *Romana (Mansi* VIII. p. 284): Aliorum forte hominum causas Deus voluerit per homines terminare: sedis istius præsulem suo, sine quæstione, reservavit arbitrio. Comp. § 90, note 12.

[15] Namely, *Conc. Sinuessanum de Marcellini P. condemnatione* (quod thurificasset) pretended D. 303 *(Mansi* I. p. 1249 seq. The bishops are made to say to him: Tu eris judex: ex te enim damnaberis, et ex te justificaberis, tamen in nostra præsentia. — Prima sedes non judicabitur a quoquam): *Constitutio Silvestri Episc. urbis Romæ et Domini Constantini Aug.* in Concil. Rom. dated 324 *(Mansi* II. p. 615 seq. Cap. 20: Nemo enim judicabit primam sedem, quoniam omnes sedes a prima sede justitiam desiderant temperari. Neque ab Augusto, neque ab omni clero, neque a regibus, neque a populo judex judicabitur.): *Synodi Rom.* (dated A. D. 433) *acta de causa Sixti* III. *stupro accusati, et de Polychronii Hierosolym. accusatione (Mansi* V. p. 1161 seq.). Comp. *P. Coustant. diss. de antiquis canonum collectionibus* § 97–99 (in *Gallandii de vetustis canonum collectionibus dissertationum sylloge.* T. I. p. 93 seq.

[16] Thus the passage *Cypriani lib. de unit. eccl.* (see § 66, note 7) is corrupted in *Pelagii* II. *Ep.* VI. *ad Episcc. Istriæ (Mansi* IX. p. 898).

[17] Thus, for instance, as early as the councils held under Symmachus (see notes 8 and 12), and in Ennodius (see note 13, Sirmond ad Ennod. lib. IV. Ep. 1): in the other regions of the West, however, the title of Papa was applied indiscriminately to all bishops (Walafrid Strabo, about A. D. 840, de rebus eccles. c. 7. Pope from Papa, quod cujusdam paternitatis nomen est, et clericorum congruit dignitati), until this use of it was forbidden by Gregory VII. A. D. 1075. Comp. *Jo. Diecmann de vocis Papæ ætatibus diss.* II. *Viteberg.* 1671. 4to. In the East Πάπας was the peculiar title of the patriarchs of Rome and Alexandria. — Just so in Italy, the see of Rome was called Sedes Apostolica, whilst, in the other countries of the Western Church, this name was applied to all sees alike, cf. *Gregorii Tur. hist. Franc.* IV. 26: Presbyter — Regis præsentiam adiit et hæc effatus est: Salve, Rex gloriose, Sedes enim Apostolica eminentiæ tuæ salutem mittit uberrimam. Cui ille, numquid, ait Romanam adisti urbem, ut Papæ illius nobis salutem deferas? Pater, inquit Presbyter, tuus Leontius *(Ep. Burdegalensis)* cum provincialibus suis salutem tibi mittit.

[18] *Pelagius* I. *ad Valerianum (Mansi* IX. p. 732): quotiens aliqua de universali synodo aliquibus dubitatio nascitur, ad recipiendam de eo quod non intelligunt rationem — ad apostolicas sedes pro recipienda ratione conveniant. — Quisquis ergo ab apostolicis divisus est sedibus, in schismate eum esse non dubium est. Comp. § 92, note 5. *Gregorii M.* Lib. VII. *Ep.* 40 *ad Eulogium Episc. Alexandr.* Suavissima mihi Sanctitas vestra multa in epistolis suis de s. Petri Apostolorum principis cathedra locuta est, dicens, quod ipse in ea nunc usque in suis successoribus sedeat. — Cuncta quæ dicta sunt in eo libenter accepi, quod ille mihi de Petri cathedra locutus est, qui Petri cathedram tenet. Et cum me specialis honor nullo modo delectet, valde tamen lætatus sum, quia vos, sanctissimi, quod mihi impendistis, vobismetipsis dedistis. — Cum multi sint Apostoli, pro ipso tamen principatu sola Apostolorum principis sedes in auctoritate convaluit,

that they were subject to the authority of synods,[19] and that they had no right to interfere with their brethren excepting in cases of delinquency.[20]

After the reconciliation of the Greek and Latin churches, however, the kings of the Ostrogoths became more suspicious of the Roman bishops. John I. ended his life in prison (A. D. 526),[21] and from this time forward the kings exercised great influence in the choice of the popes, and sometimes appointed them by their own authority.[22] But this was better

---

quæ in tribus locis unius est. Ipse enim sublimavit sedem, in qua etiam quiescere, et præsentem vitam finire dignatus est; ipse decoravit sedem, in qua Evangelistam discipulum misit; ipse firmavit sedem, in qua septem annis, quamvis discessurus, sedit. Cum ergo unius atque una sit sedes, cui ex auctoritate divina tres nunc Episcopi præsident, quidquid ego de vobis boni audio, hoc mihi imputo. Si quid de me boni creditis, hoc vestris meritis imputate, quia in illo unum sumus, qui ait: *ut omnes unum sint, etc. Jo.* xvii. 21. The flattery of Eulogius may be accounted for by his straitened situation, which Gregory relieved by direct presents (cf. Lib. VI. Ep. 60, VII. 40, VIII. 29).

[19] *Gelasius Ep.* XIII. (*Mansi* VIII. p. 51): confidimus, quod nullus jam veraciter Christianus ignoret, uniuscujusque synodi constitutum, quod universalis ecclesiæ probavit assensus, non aliquam magis exequi sedem præ cæteris oportere, quam primam, quæ et unamquamque synodum sua auctoritate confirmat, et continuata moderatione custodit, pro suo scilicet principatu, quem b. Petrus apostolos domini voce perceptum, ecclesia nihilominus subsequente, et tenuit semper et retinet.

[20] *Gregorii M.* Lib. IX. *Epist.* 59 *ad Joh. Episc. Syracus.* Si qua culpa in Episcopis inventur, nescio quis ei (sedi apostolicæ) subjectus non sit: cum vero culpa non exigit, omnes secundum rationem humilitatis æquales sunt. Lib. XI. Ep. 37 *ad Romanum defensorem:* Pervenit ad nos, quod si quis contra clericos quoslibet causam habeat, despectis eorum Episcopis, eosdem clericos in tuo facias judicio exhibere. Quod si ita est, quia valde constat esse incongruum, hac tibi auctoritate præcipimus, ut hoc denuo facere non præsumas. — Nam si sua unicuique Episcopo jurisdictio non servatur, quid aliud agitur, nisi ut per nos, per quos ecclesiasticus custodiri debuit ordo, confundatur? (Lib. II. Ep. 52: mihi injuriam facio, si fratrum meorum jura perturbo.) — Lib. VIII. Ep. 30 *ad Eulogium Episc. Alexandr.* Indicare quoque vestra Beatitudo studuit, jam se quibusdam (the patriarch of Constantinople) non scribere superba vocabula, quæ ex vanitatis radice prodierunt, et mihi loquitur, dicens: *sicut jussistis.* Quod verbum jussionis peto a meo auditu removere, quia scio, qui sum, qui estis. Loco enim mihi fratres estis, moribus patres. Non ergo jussi, sed quæ utilia visa sunt, indicare curavi. Non tamen invenio vestram Beatitudinem hoc ipsum, quod memoriæ vestræ intuli, perfecte retinere voluisse. Nam dixi, nec mihi vos, nec cuiquam alteri tale aliquid scribere debere: et ecce in præfatione epistolæ, quam ad me ipsum qui prohibui direxistis, superbæ appellationis verbum, universalem me Papam dicentes, imprimere curastis. Quod peto dulcissima mihi Sanctitas vestra ultra non faciat, quia vobis subtrahitur, quod alteri plus quam ratio exigit præbetur. — Nec honorem esse deputo, in quo fratres meos honorem suum perdere cognosco. — Si enim universalem me Papam vestra Sanctitas dicit, negat se hoc esse, quod me fatetur universum. Sed absit hoc. Recedant verba, quæ vanitatem inflant et caritatem vulnerant.

[21] *Anastasii Lib. Pontific.* c. 54 *in vita Joannis. Historia miscella.* lib. 15 (in *Muratori Scriptt. Ital.* T. I. p. 103) Manso Gesch. d. ostgoth. Reiches in Italien S. 163 ff.

[22] Thus Theodoric appointed Felix III. *Cassiodori variarum* Lib. VIII. Ep. 15, comp. Sartorius Vers. ueber die Regierung der Ostgothen in Italien. S. 138 ff. 308 ff. See Athalaric's edict. addressed to John II. prohibiting the practice of bribery at the election of Popes and Bishops, A. D. 533. *Cassiod. Variar.* IX. Ep. 15, with a commentary by Manso l. c. S. 416 ff.

than the Byzantine yoke, to which the popes were subjected after the conquest of Italy by the emperors (A. D. 535 – 554). For though Justinian held them in high honor,[23] he did not distinguish them above the bishops of Constantinople,[24] and in fact his only aim seemed to be to get the whole power into his own hands, as well in the church as the state. Two of his creatures, Vigilius and Pelagius I., were successively appointed to the papal see; and the fatal effects of this on the prosperity of the church of Rome were soon seen. In the controversy concerning the three chapters, the bishop of Rome was forced by the emperor to condemn them, and for so doing was long considered in the Western church to have departed from his orthodoxy, so that the bishops of the diocese of Italy broke off all communion with Rome. The bishops of Milan and Ravenna, indeed, were soon reconciled (A. D. 570 – 580); but the bishop of Aquileia (who since the incursions of the Lombards into Italy (A. D. 508), resided on the island Grado) and the Istrian bishops were more obstinate, and did not renew their communion with Rome till the year 700.[25]

---

[23] Justinian A. D. 633 to the patriarch of Constantinople. *Cod. Justin.* I. 1, 7: *οὔτε γὰρ ἀνιχόμεθά τι τῶν εἰς ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ὁρώντων κατάστασιν, μὴ καὶ τῇ αὐτοῦ (τοῦ πάπα τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ρώμης καὶ πατριάρχου) ἀναφέρεσθαι μακαριότητι, ὡς κεφαλῇ οὔσῃ πάντων τῶν ὁσιωτάτων τοῦ θεοῦ ἱερέων, καὶ ἐπειδὴ, ὁσάκις ἐν τούτοις τοῖς μέρεσιν αἱρετικοὶ ἀνεφύησαν, τῇ γνώμῃ καὶ ὀρθῇ κρίσει τοῦ ἐκείνου σεβασμίου θρόνου κατηργήθησαν. Ibid.* L. 8, *Justinianus ad Joannem* II. P. Nec enim patimur quicquam, quod ad Ecclesiarum statum pertinet, quamvis manifestum et indubitatum sit, quod movetur, ut non etiam vestræ innotescat sanctitati, quæ caput est omnium sanctarum Ecclesiarum. Per omnia enim (ut dictum est) properamus, honorem et auctoritatem crescere vestræ sedis.

[24] *Cod. Justin.* I. 2, 25: *Ἡ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἐκκλησία πασῶν τῶν ἄλλων ἐστὶ κεφαλή.* On the other hand the right of appeal to the patriarch of Constantinople from all other ecclesiastical authorities (see § 92, note 18) seems to have fallen entirely into oblivion, and it is doubtful if it ever extended beyond the dioceses of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace. The right of appeal is thus fixed by Justinian, *Cod.* 1, 4, 29: Bishop — Metropolitan and his synod — Patriarch. From the decision of this last, as from that of the Prætorian Prefect (Cod. Just. VII. 62, 19) there is no appeal. No complaint is to be brought before the Patriarch first, *πλὴν εἰ μὴ τὴν αἰτίασιν τὶς ἐπὶ τούτῳ θείη, ἐφ' ᾧτε παραπεμφθῆναι τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τῷ τῆς χώρας θεοφιλεστάτῳ ἐπισκόπῳ. τηνικαῦτα γὰρ ἄδεια μὲν ἔσται τὴν αἰτίασιν ἀποτίθεσθαι καὶ παρὰ τοῖς θεοφιλεστάτοις πατριάρχαις,* i. e. "unless accompanied with the express petition, that the affair shall be delegated to the bishop of the particular province. In that case it shall be allowed to bring a complaint before the Patriarch." Then § 2: *Εἰ μέντοι παραπεμφθείσης τῆς ὑποθέσεως παρὰ τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου πατριάρχου ἢ τινι τῶν θεοφιλεστάτων μητροπολιτῶν, ἢ ἄλλῳ τῶν θεοφιλεστάτων ἐπισκόπων, ἐνεχθείη ψῆφος, καὶ μὴ στερχθείη παρὰ θατέρου μέρους, ἐκκλητός τε γένηται· τηνικαῦτα ἐπὶ τὸν ἀρχιερατικὸν θρόνον (Vers. lat.* ad Archiepiscopalem *hanc* sedem) *φέρεσθαι τὴν ἔφεσιν, κἀκεῖσε κατὰ τὸ μέχρι νῦν κρατοῦν ἐξετάζεσθαι,* i. e. "when the complaint has been transferred to some particular bishop, or Metropolitan by the Patriarch, and either party, dissatisfied with the sentence, shall appeal, that appeal shall be made to the Archbishop." *ὁ ἀρχιερατικὸς θρόνος* is the delegating Patriarch or Archbishop, not exclusively, as the Latin translation of the Anton. Augustinus gives it, the Patriarch of Constantinople. Ziegler, also, Geschichte der kirchl. Verfassungsformen, S. 232 ff., has entirely misunderstood this law.

[25] *J. F. B. M. de Rubeis* de schismate eccl. Aquileiensi diss. hist. Venet. 1732, 8vo. republished in a larger form in *Ejusd. monimenta eccl. Aquileiensis* 1740. fol. Walchs Ketzerhist. Th. 8. S. 331 ff.

From the time of the incursion of the Lombards, however, the church of Rome was relieved from the evil influence of the imperial power. The possessions of the emperors in Italy were now only the exarchate of Ravenna, the duchy of Rome and Naples, the cities on the coast of Liguria, and the extreme provinces of the South. Constantly threatened by the Lombards, and often entirely forsaken by the emperors, the inhabitants of these districts were for the most part thrown on their own resources for defence. In all measures of this sort the popes took the lead, as possessing the largest extent of territory,[26] and besides peculiarly interested in escaping from the power of these Arian barbarians. In this manner they not only gained great political influence,[27] but likewise became more inde-

---

[26] As the emperors called their own fortunes *patrimonium* (namely Patrimonium privatum s. Dominicum, their *private property*, and Patrimonium sacratum s. divinæ domus, their *domains*, see *Gutherius de offic. dom. Aug.* lib. III. c. 25. *Pancirolius ad notit. dignitatum Imp. Orient.* c. 87); so the churches called their possessions the *Patrimonia* of their saints. Thus that of the Roman church was the Patrimonium s. Petri. At the same time the single estates, which were improved by Defensoribus or Rectoribus, were also called *Patrimonia*. cf. *Zaccaria diss. de patrimoniis s. Rom. eccl.* in his *De rebus ad hist. atque antiquitt. ecclesiæ pertinentibus dissertt. latinæ. (Fulginiæ Tomi* II. 1781. 4to. T. II. p. 68 seq. Plancks Gesch. d. christl. kirchl. Gesellschaftsverf. Bd. 1. S. 629. *C. H, Sack de patrimoniis eccl. Rom. circa finem sæculi* VI. in his *Commentationes, quæ ad theol. hist. pertinent, tres. Bonnæ*, 1821. 8vo. p. 25 seq.) For an account of the activity of the Popes in defending Italy, comp. *Gregorii M.* Lib. V. Ep. 21 *ad Constantinam Aug.:* Viginti autem jam et septem annos ducimus, quod in hac urbe inter Langobardorum gladios vivimus. Quibus quam multa hac ab Ecclesia quotidianis diebus erogantur, ut inter eos vivere possimus, suggerenda non sunt. Sed breviter indico, quia sicut in Ravennæ partibus Dominorum Pietas apud primum exercitum Italiæ saccellarium habet, qui causis supervenientibus quotidianas expensas faciat, ita et in hac urbe in causis talibus eorum saccellarius ego sum. Et tamen hæc Ecclesia, quæ uno eodemque tempore Clericis, monasteriis, pauperibus, populo, atque insuper Langobardis tam multa indesinenter expendit, ecce adhuc ex omnium Ecclesiarum premitur afflictione, quæ de hac unius hominis *(Johannis Jejunat.)* superbia multum gemunt, etsi nihil dicere præsumunt.

[27] *Gregorii M.* Lib. II. Ep. 31 *ad cunctos milites Neapolitanos;* Summa militiæ laus inter alia bona merita hæc est, obedientiam sanctæ Reipublicæ utilitatibus exhibere, quodque sibi utiliter imperatum fuerit, obtemperare: sicut et nunc devotionem vestram fecisse didicimus, quæ Epistolis nostris, quibus magnificum virum Constantium Tribunum custodiæ civitatis deputavimus præesse, paruit, et congruam militaris devotionis obedientiam demonstravit. Unde scriptis vos præsentibus curavimus admonendos, uti prædicto viro magnifico Tribuno sicut et fecistis, omnem debeatis pro serenissimorum dominorum utilitate, vel conservanda civitate obedientiam exhibere, etc. Comp. the extract from the Acts of Honorius I. 625–638), ed. by *Muratori antiquitt. Ital.* V. p. 834, from Cencii Camerarii lib, de censibus, and more full by *Zaccaria* I. c. p. 131, from cardinal Deusdedit Collect. Cann. Idem in eodem (i. e. *Honorius in suo Registro*) Gaudisso Notario et Anatolio Magistro militum Neapolitanam civitatem regendam committit, et qualiter debeat regi, scriptis informat. It does not follow from these passages, as *Dionysius de Ste Marthe* in vita Gregorii lib. III. c. 9, no. 6 (Greg. Opp. IV., p. 271) and *Zaccaria* l. c. p. 112, 131, conclude from them that the city of Naples belonged to the Patrimonium s. Petri, but only that when that city was hard pressed, the popes, who had considerable possessions there (patrimonium Neapolitanum and Campanum *Zaccarii* p. 111), (cf. *Gregor. M.* Lib. II. Ep. 46 *ad Johannem Episc. Ravennæ:* De Neapolitana vero urbe excellentissimo Exarcho instanter imminente vobis indicamus, quia Arigis — valde insidiatur

pendent of the emperors in ecclesiastical matters. As citizens, however, they still remained subject to the emperors and their representatives, the exarchs of Ravenna.[28]

Towards the end of this period the flames of controversy were once more kindled between the two first dignitaries of the Christian church by the ambition of the patriarch of Constantinople. In the year 587 John, called jejunator, assumed the title of Patriarcha universalis, οἰκουμενικὸς (universal patriarch).[29] Highly incensed at this presumption, Pope Pelagius II.,[30] and still more indignantly Pope Gregory, called the Great, rejected this appellation as savoring of Antichrist and the devil; though all their efforts and protestations seemed to make but little impression on the emperor Mauricius, and his favorite the patriarch.[31] Devoutly therefore did Gregory thank Providence, when Phocas, the murderer of Mauricius, ascended the throne (A. D. 602);[32] and Phocas repaid his devotion by taking

---

eidem civitati, in quam si celeriter dux non mittatur, omnino jam inter perditas habetur) took the necessary measures instead of the exarch, cf. *Sack* l. c. p. 52.

[28] cf. *Gregorii M.* Lib. III. Ep. 65, see § 114, note 2. For the official authorities concerning the relations of the ecclesiastical to the civil power, and in particular, concerning the right of the Exarchs to confirm the choice of a Pope, see the *Liber diurnus Romanorum Pontiff.* More of this in the hist. of the next Period.

[29] At first applied by flatterers to all Patriarchs indiscriminately, see § 91, note 17, § 90, note 55. Ziegler Gesch. d. kirchl. Verfassungsformen S. 259. Justinian gives this title to the Patr. of Constantinople: τῷ ἁγιωτάτῳ καὶ μακαριωτάτῳ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ τῆς βασιλίδος ταύτης πόλεως καὶ οἰκουμενικῷ πατριάρχῃ. *Cod.* I., 1, 7. *Novell.* III. V. VI. VII. XVI. XLII. —

[30] *Gregorii M.* Lib. V. Ep. 18. The letter of *Pelagii ad Joh. Const.* (*Mansi* IX. p. 900) is pseudo-isidorian. s. Blondelli pseudo-isidorus, p. 636 seq.

[31] *Gregorii M.* lib. V. Ep. 18, *ad Johann.*: — Si ergo ille (Paulus) membra dominici corporis certis extra Christum quasi capitibus, et ipsis quidem Apostolis subjici partialiter evitavit (1 Cor. i. 12 seq.): tu quid Christo, universalis scilicet Ecclesiæ capiti, in extremi judicii es dicturus examine, qui cuncta ejus membra tibimet conaris universalis appellatione supponere? Quis, rogo, in hoc tam perverso vocabulo, nisi ille ad imitandum proponitur, qui despectis Angelorum legionibus secum socialiter constitutis, ad culmen conatus est singularitatis erumpere, ut et nulli subesse et solus omnibus præesse videretur? — Certe Petrus Apostolorum primus, membrum sanctæ et universalis Ecclesiæ, Paulus, Andreas, Johannes, *quid aliud quam singularium sunt plebium capita?* et tamen sub uno capite omnes membra. — Numquid non — per venerandum Chalcedonense Concilium hujus apostolicæ sedis Antistites, cui Deo disponente deservio, universales oblato honore vocati sunt? (comp. S. 481, note.) Sed tamen nullus umquam tali vocabulo appellari voluit, nullus sibi hoc temerarium nomen arripuit: ne si sibi in Pontificatus gradu gloriam singularitatis arriperet, hanc omnibus fratribus denegasse videretur. — *Ep.* 19 *ad Sabinianum* Diac. (Apocrisiarium). *Ep.* 20 *ad Mauricium Aug. Ep.* 21 *ad Constantinam Aug. Ep.* 43, *ad Eulogium Ep. Alexandr. et Anastasium Antiochenum.* Lib. VII. Ep. 4, 5, and 31, *ad Cyriacum Ep. Constant. Ep.* 27 *ad Anastas. Antioch. Ep.* 33, *ad Mauricium Aug.* (Ego autem fidenter dico, quia quisquis se universalem Sacerdotem vocat, vel vocari desiderat, in elatione sua Antichristum præcurrit, quia superbiendo se ceteris præponit. Nec dispari superbia ad errorem ducitur, quia sicut perversus ille Deus videri vult super omnes homines: ita quisquis iste est, qui solus Sacerdos appellari appetit, super reliquos Sacerdotes se extollit.) *Ep.* 34 *ad Eulogium Alex. et Anastas. Ant.* — How earnestly Gregory rejected this title for himself, see Lib. VIII. Ep. 30 *ad Eulogium Ep. Alex.* see note 18.

[32] Comp. the congratulations of *Gregory*, lib. XIII. Ep. 31, *ad Phocam Imp.*

his part against the patriarch.[33] Since that time, however, this title (Patriarcha universalis) has been constantly assumed by the patriarch of Constantinople.

At this time the popes began to bestow the Pallium (with which in the East all bishops were invested at their consecration)[34] on all the most considerable bishops of the Western church, as at once the symbol and the seal of their connexion with the church of Rome.[35]

---

[33] The patriarch Cyrianus was an adherent of Marcian (*Theophanes* p. 242 seq.). *Anastasius de vitis Pontific.* c. 67, Bonifacius III.: Hic obtinuit apud Phocam Principem, ut sedes Apostolica B. Petri Apostoli caput esset omnium ecclesiarum, i. e. Ecclesia Romana, quia Ecclesia Constantinopolitana primam se omnium Ecclesiarum scribebat. The same words *Paulus Warnefridi* de gestis Langob. IV. 37. Their authenticity doubted by *J. M. Lorenz* examen decreti Phocæ de primatu Rom. Pont. Argent. 1790. Schröckhs Kirchengesch. Th. 17. S. 72 ff. The view taken of the subject by *Gotfridus Viterbiensis* (about 1186) in his *Pantheon* P. XVI (*Pistorii Rer. Germ. Script. ed Struve.* T. II. p. 289) is remarkable.

Tertius est Papa Bonifacius ille benignus,
Qui petit a Phoca munus per secula dignum,
Ut sedes Petri prima sit: ille dedit.
Prima prius fuerat Constantinopolitana;
Est modo Romana, meliori dogmate clara.

[34] See § 99, note 1). The notion of *Petrus de Marca de Conc. Sac. et Imp.* Lib. VI. c. 6, and from him almost universally adopted, that the Pallium was a part of the imperial costume, and hence bestowed only by the emperors or by the Patriarchs only with permission of the emperors, is confuted by *J. G. Pertsch de origine, usu et auctoritate pallii archiepiscopalis. Helmst.* 1754. 4to.

[35] The oldest document on the subject is *Symmachi P. Ep. ad Theodorum Laureacensem* (*Mansi* VIII. p. 228) about 501: Diebus vitæ tuæ pallii usum, quem ad sacerdotalis officii decorem et ad ostendendam unanimitatem, quam cum b. Petro apostolo universum gregem dominicarum ovium, quæ ei commissæ sunt, habere dubium non est, ab apostolica sede, sicut decuit, poposcisti, quod utpote ab eisdem apostolis fundatæ ecclesiæ majorum more libenter indulsimus ad ostendendum te magistrum et archiepiscopum, tuamque sanctam Laureasensem ecclesiam provinciæ Pannoniorum sedem fore metropolitanam. Idcirco pallio, quod ex apostolica caritate tibi destinamus, quo uti debeas secundum morem ecclesiæ tuæ, solerter admonemus pariterque volumus, ut intelligas, quia ipse vestitus, quo ad missarum solemnia ornaris, signum prætendit crucis, per quod scito te cum fratribus debere compati ac mundialibus illecebris in affectu crucifigi, etc. (The formula in *Liber diurnus*, cap. IV. tit. 3, is abbreviated from this epistle). According to *Vigilius P.* Ep. VII. *ad Auxanium Arelatensem* (*Mansi* IX. p. 42) Symmachus also invested Cæsarius, bishop of Arles, with the Pallium. These investitures became more frequent under Gregory the Great, not only in the cases of Metropolitans, like John of Corinth, Leo of Prima Justinianea, Vigilius of Arles, Augustine of Canterbury, but also of simple bishops, as Donus of Messina, John of Syracuse, John of Palermo, etc. vid. *Pertsch.* l. c. p. 134 seq.—Though *Vigilius P. Ep.* VI. *ad Auxanium Arelatensem* (*Mansi* IX. p. 40) writes: De his vero, quæ caritas vestra tam de usu pallii, quam de aliis sibi a nobis petiit debere concedi, libenti hoc animo etiam in præsenti facere sine dilatione potuimus, nisi cum christianissimi Domini filii nostri imperatoris hoc, sicut ratio postulat, voluissemus perficere notitia; and *Gregorius* I. Lib. IX. Ep. 11 *ad Brunichildem Reginam*, mentions the necessity of the imperial approbation, yet it was probably sought for only when the Pallium was sent into hostile countries, see *Pertsch* l. c. 196 seq. That a tax was very early connected with this investiture, see *Gregorii* I. Lib. V. Ep. 57 *ad Johannem Ep. Corinth.* (also *Gratianus Dist. C.* c. 3): Novit autem Fraternitas vestra, quia prius pallium nisi dato commodo non dabatur. Quod quoniam incongruum erat facto Concilio tam de hoc quam de ordinationibus aliquid accipere sub districta interdictione vetuimus. The decree referred to is in *Mansi* IX. p. 1227.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

HISTORY OF MONACHISM.

For references, vid. § 93.

§ 116.

In the East monachism continued to flourish in all its various forms.[1] The laws of Justinian were in general favorable to it,[2] though he attempted to restrain the irregular wanderings of the Cœnobites from convent to convent.[3] In these regions the Stylites still continued to be the objects of universal admiration, especially a certain Daniel, in the neighbourhood of Constantinople, under the emperors Basiliscus and Zeno; but an attempt being made in the neighbourhood of Triers to imitate these extravagancies, it was at

---

[1] Comp. the description of Evagrius I. 21. The spirit of the oriental monks of the time may be seen from *Johannis Moschi* (about A. D. 630) λειμών, *pratum spirituale* (contin. in *Herib. Rosweydi vitæ patrum. Antverp.* 1615. fol. p. 855 seq. The Latin original though defective in *Frontonis Ducæi Auctarium Bibl. PP.* T. II. p. 1057, the defects supplied in *Cotelerii Monum. Eccl. Gr.* T. II. p. 341). Even in this we find complaints of the decay of Monachism, c. 130: οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν τὴν ἐγκράτειαν καὶ τὴν ἀκτημοσύνην μέχρι θανάτου ἐτήρησαν· ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐπλατύναμεν τὰς κοιλίας ἡμῶν καὶ βαλάντια κ. τ. λ. cf. cap. 52 and 168.

[2] *Cod. Justin.* I. 3, 53 (A. D. 532) orders μηδένα παντελῶς, μήτε βουλευτὴν μήτε ταξεώτην ἐπίσκοπον ἢ πρεσβύτερον τοῦ λοιποῦ γίνεσθαι, though it adds: πλὴν εἰ μὴ ἐκ νηπίας ἡλικίας, καὶ οὕπω τὴν ἥβην ἐκβάσης, ἔτυχε τοῖς εὐλαβεστάτοις μοναχοῖς ἐγκαταλειγμένος, καὶ διαμείνας ἐπὶ τούτου τοῦ σχήματος. τηνικαῦτα γὰρ ἐρίμειν αὐτῷ καὶ πρεσβυτέρῳ γενέσθαι, καὶ εἰς ἐπισκοπὴν ἐλθεῖν, — τὴν τετάρτην μέντοι μοῖραν τῆς αὐτοῦ περιουσίας ἀπάσης παρέχων τοῖς βουλευταῖς, καὶ τῷ δημοσίῳ. § 3: Ἔτι θεσπίζομεν, εἴτε ἀνὴρ ἐπὶ μονήρη βίον ἐλθεῖν βουληθείη, εἴτε γυνὴ τὸν ἄνδρα καταλιποῦσα πρὸς ἄσκησιν ἔλθοι, μὴ τοῦτο αὐτὸ ζημίας παρέχειν πρόφασιν, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν οἰκεῖα πάντως λαμβάνειν. cf. *Novell.* CXXIII. c. 40: Εἰ δὲ συνιεστῶτος ἔτι τοῦ γάμου ὁ ἀνὴρ μόνος ἢ ἡ γυνὴ μόνη εἰσέλθῃ εἰς μοναστήριον, διαλυέσθω ὁ γάμος, καὶ δίχα βεττουδίου. (On the other hand *Gregorius M.* Lib. XI. Ep. 45: Si enim dicunt, religionis causa conjugia debere dissolvi, sciendum est, quia etsi hoc lex humana concessit, divina lex tamen prohibuit. cf. *Bingham* Lib. VII. c. 3, § 3, vol. III. p. 45 seq.) *Cod. Just.* I. 3, 55: Ut non liceat parentibus impedire, quominus liberi eorum volentes monachi aut clerici fiant, aut eam ob solam causam exheredare (cf. Nov. CXXIII. c. 41). — Nov. V. c. 2, allows slaves to go into convents without leave of their masters.

[3] *Novella* V. *de Monachis* A. D. 535) cap. 4: Εἰ δέ τις ἅπαξ ἑαυτὸν καθιερώσας τῷ μοναστηρίῳ, καὶ τοῦ σχήματος τυχὼν, εἶτα ἀναχωρῆσαι τοῦ μοναστηρίου βουληθείη, καὶ ἰδιώτην τυχὸν ἐλέσθαι βίον· αὐτὸς μὲν ἔστω, τοίαν ὑπὲρ τούτου δώσει τῷ θεῷ τὴν ἀπολογίαν, τὰ πράγματα μέντοι ὁπόσα ἂν ἔχοι ἡνίκα εἰς τὸ μοναστήριον εἰσήει, ταῦτα τῆς δισποτείας ἔσται τοῦ μοναστηρίου, καὶ οὐδ' ὁτιοῦν παντελῶς ἐξάξει. cap. 7: Εἰ δὲ ἀπολιπὼν τὸ μοναστήριον, καθ' ὅπερ τὴν ἄσκησιν εἶχεν, εἰς ἕτερον μεταβαίνοι μοναστήριον, καὶ οὕτω μὲν ἢ αὐτοῦ περιουσία μενέτω τε καὶ ἐκδικείσθω ὑπὸ τοῦ προτέρου μοναστηρίου, ἔνθα ἀποταξάμενος τοῦτο κατέλιπε. προσῆκον δέ ἐστι τοὺς εὐλαβεστάτους ἡγουμένους μὴ εἰσδέχεσθαι τὸν τοῦτο πράττοντα.

once prohibited by the bishop.[4] The so-called κατειργμένοι (Recluses) of the East, however, found many imitators, especially in Gaul.[5]

§ 117.

BENEDICTINES.

Jo. Mabillonii Annales ordinis S. Benedicti, VI Tomi (the 6th., edited by *Edm. Martene*, reaches to the year 1157). Paris, 1703 – 1739. auct. Lucæ, 1739 – 1745. fol. — *Lucæ Dacherii* et *Jo. Mabillonii* Acta Sanctorum Ord. S. Benedicti (six centuries to 1100). IX voll. 1668 – 1701. fol.

Benedict, a native of Nursia in Umbria,[1] now gave a new form to monastic life. After having long lived as a hermit, he founded a convent on a mountain in Campania, the site of the old castrum Cassinum (hence called monasterium Cassinense, Monte Cassino). Here he introduced a new system (A. D. 529),[2] which, whilst it avoided the extreme rigor of the Eastern systems,[3] prescribed a variety of suitable employments for the monks;[4] but differed most from

---

[4] Gregor. Turon. VIII. 15.

[5] e. g. Gregor. Tur. II. 37; V. 9, 10; VI. 6.

[1] His biographer is Gregorius M. in dialogorum lib. secundo.

[2] *Regula Benedicti* in 73 Capp. (in Hospinian, and many other places, — best in *Luc. Holstenii codex regularum monastic. et canon. Romæ* 1661. III. voll. 4to., *auctus a Marian. Brokie. August. Vindel.* 1759. VI. voll. fol. and thence in *Gallandii Bibl.* PP. T. XI. p. 298 seq. Amongst the numerous commentaries, the best by *Edm. Martene.* Paris. 1690. 4to., and by *Augustin Calmet.* Paris. 1734. 2 T. 4to.) General regulations: *Cap.* 64: In *Abbatis* ordinatione illa semper consideretur ratio, ut hic constituatur, quem sibi omnis concors congregatio secundum timorem Dei, sive etiam pars, quamvis parva, congregationis, saniori consilio, elegerit. *Cap.* 65: Quemcunque elegerit Abbas cum consilio fratrum timentium Deum, ordinet ipse sibi *Præpositum.* Qui tamen Præpositus illa agat cum reverentia, quæ ab Abbate suo ei injuncta fuerint, nihil contra Abbatis voluntatem aut ordinationem faciens. *Cap.* 21: Si major fuerit congregatio, eligantur de ipsis fratres boni testimonii et sanctæ conversationis, et constituantur Decani, qui solicitudinem gerant super Decanias suas. *Cap.* 3: Quoties aliqua præcipua agenda sunt in monasterio, convocet Abbas omnem congregationem, et dicat ipse unde agitur. Et audiens consilium fratrum, tractet apud se, et quod utilius judicaverit faciat. — Si qua vero minora agenda sunt in monasterii utilitatibus, seniorum tantum utatur consilio. *Cap.* 5: Primus humilitatis gradus est obedientia sine mora. Hæc convenit iis, qui nihil sibi a Christo carius aliquid existimant, propter servitium sanctum, quod professi sunt, seu propter metum gehennæ, vel gloriam vitæ æternæ, mox ut aliquid imperatum a majore fuerit, ac si divinitus imperetur, moram pati nesciunt in faciendo.

[3] *Cap.* 39 appoints for the daily food cocta duo pulmentaria (ut forte, qui ex uno non potuerit edere, ex alio reficiatur). Et si fuerint inde poma aut nascentia leguminum, addatur et tertium. Also panis libra una and *cap.* 40 hemina vini. (Different opinions concerning the hemina, *Martene comm. in Reg. S. Bened.* p. 539 seq.) On the other hand carnium quadrupedum ab omnibus abstineatur comestio, præter omnino debiles et ægrotos. *Cap.* 36: balneorum usus infirmis, quoties expedit, offeratur. Sanis autem, et maxime juvenibus, tardius concedatur.

[4] *Cap.* 48: Otiositas inimica est animæ: et ideo certis temporibus occupari debent fratres in labore manuum, certis iterum horis in lectione divina. Between

other systems in exacting a promise from all who entered a convent to remain for life, and strictly to observe its rules.[5] This system was soon generally adopted in Italy, Gaul, and Spain. Instead of scattered convents, without connexion or communication, they all were now united together; and thus arose the first monastic order. As yet, however, we find no trace of any literary pursuits amongst the monks, either in the rules of Benedict, or the history of the early Benedictines.[6] *Cassiodorus* made the first attempt of this kind, in the convent called Vivarium (Cœnobium Vivariense, A. D. 538) near Squillacci in Bruttia;[7] where these were united with other useful employments.[8] The Benedictines very soon followed this example;

---

these the horæ canonicæ, namely, the nocturnæ vigiliæ, Matutinæ, Tertia, Sexta, Nona, Vespera and Completorium (see Cap. 8 – 19), Cap. 16. justified by Ps. cxviii. 164. Septies in die laudem dixi tibi, and v. 62, media nocte surgebam ad confitendum tibi.

[5] *Cap.* 58: After ordering a probation of the noviter venientis ad conversionem: si habita secum deliberatione promiserit se omnia custodire et cuncta sibi imperata servare, tunc suscipiatur in congregatione, sciens se jam sub lege regulæ constitutum, quod ei ex illa die non liceat egredi de monasterio, nec collum excutere de subjugo regulæ, quam sub tam morosa deliberatione licuit aut excusare, aut suscipere. Suscipiendus autem in oratorio coram omnibus promittat de *stabilitate sua, et conversione morum suorum, et obedientia* coram Deo et sanctis ejus, ut si aliquando aliter fecerit, ab eo se damnandum sciat, quem irridet. De qua promissione sua faciat petitionem ad nomen Sanctorum, quorum reliquiæ ibi sunt, et Abbatis præsentis. Quam petitionem manu sua scribat, aut certe, si non scit literas, alter ab eo rogatus scribat, et ille novitius signum faciat, et manu sua eam super altare ponat. *Cap.* 59: Si quis forte de nobilibus offert filium suum Deo in monasterio, si ipse puer minori ætate est, parentes ejus faciant petitionem, quam supra diximus. Et cum oblatione ipsam petitionem, et manum pueri involvant in palla altaris, et sic eum offerant. — *Cap.* 66: Monasterium autem si possit fieri, ita debet construi, ut omnia necessaria, id est aqua, molendinum, hortus, pistrinum, vel artes diversæ intra monasterium exerceantur, ut non sit necessitas Monachis vagandi foras, quia omnino non expedit animabus eorum.

[6] See *Rich. Simon critique de la bibliotheque de Mr. Ell. du Pin* (Paris. 1730. 4 Tom. 8vo.) T. I. p. 211 seq.

[7] That he introduced the rules of Benedict into his convent, as the Benedictines assert (see *Garetius* in the *vita Cass.* prefixed to his Opp. 27), has been satisfactorily disproved by *Baronius* ad ann. 494.

[8] For this object he wrote his works *de institutione divinarum literarum*, and *de artibus ac disciplinis liberalium litterarum.* He exhorts them, first of all, to study the Scrippt. and the Fathers. And then adds *De instit. div. litt.* c. 28: Verumtamen nec illud Patres sanctissimi decreverunt, ut sæcularium litterarum studia respuantur: quia exinde non minimum ad sacras scripturas intelligendas sensus noster instruitur. — Frigidus obstiterit circum præcordia sanguis, ut nec humanis nec divinis litteris perfecte possit erudiri: aliqua tamen scientiæ mediocritate suffultus, eligat certe quod sequitur:

Rura mihi et rigui placeant in vallibus amnes.

Quia nec ipsum est a Monachis alienum hortos colere, agros exercere, et pomorum fœcunditate gratulari. *Cap.* 30: Ego tamen fateor votum meum, quod inter vos quæcumque possunt corporeo labore compleri, Antiquariorum mihi studia (si tamen veraciter scribant) non immerito forsan plus placere; quod et mentem suam relegendo scripturas divinas salubriter instruant, et Domini præcepta scribendo longe lateque disseminent (Comp. the directions for copying and revising manuscripts, *cap.* 15, and the work *De orthographia*). — *Cap.* 31: Sed et vos alloquor fratres egregios, qui humani corporis salutem sedula curiositate tractatis, et confugientibus ad loca sanctorum officia beatæ pietatis impenditis. Et ideo discite quidem

and thus the monks began to be useful to society in various ways — reclaiming waste lands, advancing actively the cause of education,[9] preserving the history of the time in their chronicles, and multiplying the treasures of antiquity by their copyists.[10]

§ 118.

RELATION OF THE MONKS TO THE CLERGY.

Though the clergy continued to be very often chosen from amongst the monks, yet in the convents there were no more ordained monks than were absolutely necessary to conduct the religious services; and many convents had no presbyter whatever.[1] The old rule, that every convent should be subject to the bishop of the diocese in which it was situated,[2] was first departed from in Africa, the monks voluntarily putting themselves under the superintendence of distant bishops, especially the bishop of Carthage,[3] for the sake of preserving their independence. In all other countries the old custom was still observed,[4] whilst the convents were protected from oppression by a law

---

naturas herbarum, commixtionesque specierum sollicita mente tractate. He recommends to them the writings of Dioscorides, Hippocrates, and Galenus. Compare Staudlin im Kirchenhist. Archive für 1825. S. 413 ff.

[9] Speaking of Benedict himself, Gregor. M. dial. II. cap. 3, says: Cœpere etiam tunc ad eum Romanæ urbis nobiles et religiosi concurrere, suosque ei filios omnipotenti Deo nutriendos dare. For such boys the convent schools were primarily instituted.

[10] cf. *Mabillon Acta SS. Ord. Bened.* Tom. I. *Præf.* no. 114 et 115.

[1] Presbyters were sent into the convents by the bishops (directi, deputati) ad missas celebrandas. *Gregor. M.* lib. VI. ep. 46. VII. 43. — Abbots made the prayers and had permission in monasterio Presbyterum, qui sacra Missarum solemnia celebrare debeat, ordinari. The same VI. 42, IX. 92: or else a Presbyter was appointed to the convent, quem et in monasterio habitare, et inde vitæ subsidia habere necesse fuit. The same, IV. 18. — On the other hand, *Gregor.* lib. VI. ep. 56, praises a convent of which he had heard, et Presbyteros et Diaconos cunctamque congregationem unanimes vivere ac concordes.

[2] *Conc. Chalced. can.* 4.

[3] *Conc. Carthag. ann.* 525, *Dies secunda* (*Mansi* VIII. p. 648 seq.) The prayer of Abbas Petrus to the bishop, Boniface of Carthage, p. 653: — humiles supplicamus, ut — a jugo nos clericorum, quod neque nobis neque patribus nostris quisquam superponere aliquando tentavit, eruere digneris. Nam docemus, monasterium de Præcisu, quod in medio plebium Leptimensis ecclesiæ ponitur, prætermisso eodem Episcopo vicino, Vico Ateriensis ecclesiæ Episcopi consolationem habere, qui in longinquo positus est. — Nam et de Adrumetino monasterio nullo modo silere possumus, qui prætermisso ejusdem civitatis Episcopo de transmarinis partibus sibi semper presbyteros ordinaverunt. — Et cum sibi diversa monasteria, ut ostenderent libertatem suam, unicuique prout visum est, a diversis Episcopis consolationem quæsierint: quomodo nobis denegari poterit, qui de hac sede sancta Carthaginensis ecclesiæ, quæ prima totius Africanæ ecclesiæ haberi videtur, auxilium quæsivimus? etc. cf. *Concil. Carthagin. ann.* 534 (*Mansi* VIII. p. 841) cf. *Thomassinus*, P. I. L. III. c. 31.

[4] *Conc. Aurelian.* I. (511) can. 19. *Epaonense* (517) can. 19. *Arelatense* V (554) can. 7.

forbidding the interference of the bishops in their internal administration.[5] Pope Gregory the Great was especially distinguished for his protection of the convents.[6]

CHAPTER FIFTH.

HISTORY OF PUBLIC WORSHIP.

§ 119.

The mistaken character of public worship in this period,[1] and the superstitious notions connected with it, may be best gathered from the writings of Gregory the Great. With much real piety,[2] he was at the same time full of monkish prejudices and credulity, whilst by

---

[5] So first *Conc. Arelatense* III. A. D. 456 (*Mansi* VII. p. 907), which limited the rights of the bishop of the diocese in the convent Lirinum as follows: ut clerici, atque alteris ministri a nullo, nisi ab ipso, vel cui ipse injunxerit, ordinentur; chrisma non nisi ab ipso speretur; neophyti si fuerint, ab eodem confirmentur; peregrini clerici absque ipsius præcepto in communionem, vel ad ministerium non admittantur. Monasterii vero omnis laica multitudo ad curam Abbatis pertineat: neque ex ea sibi Episcopus quidquam vindicet, aut aliquem ex illa clericum, nisi abbate petente, præsumat. Hoc enim et rationis et religionis plenum est, ut clerici ad ordinationem Episcopi debita subjectione respiciant: laica vero omnis monasterii congregatio ad solam ac liberam Abbatis proprii, quem sibi ipsa elegerit, ordinationem dispositionemque pertineat; regula, quæ a fundatore ipsius monasterii dudum constituta est, in omnibus custodita.

[6] Compare especially *Greg. M.* lib. VIII. ep. 15, ad Marinianum Ravennæ Episc.: Nullus audeat de reditibus vel chartis monasterii minuere. — Defuncto Abbate non extraneus nisi de eadem congregatione, quem sibi propria voluntate congregatio elegerit, ordinetur. — Invito Abbate ad ordinanda alia monasteria aut ad ordines sacros tolli exinde monachi non debent. — Descriptio rerum aut chartarum monasterii ab Ecclesiasticis fieri non debet. — Quia hospitandi occasione monasterium temporibus decessoris vestri nobis fuisse nunciatum est prægravatum: oportet ut hoc Sanctitas vestra decenter debeat temperare. Lib. VIII. ep. 34, he orders a bishop to restore what he had taken from a convent sub xenii quasi specie. On the other hand, he calls upon all bishops to keep a strict watch over the morals and discipline of the convents, lib. VI. ep. 11, VIII. ep. 34. — Other privileges which Gregory has been said to have granted to convents, for instance, the celebrated privilegium monasterii S. Medardi in Soissons (see Appendix to his epistles in the Benedictine ed.) are fictions. cf. *Thomassinus*, P. I. Lib. III. c. 30.

[1] Compare especially a *Decretum Gregorii M.* (*Opp. ed. Maur.* T. II. p. 1288. *Mansi* X. p. 434, also in *Gratianus Dist.* 92. c. 2): In sancta Romana Ecclesia — dudum consuetudo est valde reprehensibilis exorta, ut quidam ad sacri altaris ministerium Cantores eligantur, et in Diaconatus ordine constituti modulationi vocis inserviant, quos ad prædicationis officium eleemosynarumque studium vacare congruebat. Unde fit plerumque, ut ad sacrum ministerium dum blanda vox quæritur, quæri congrua vita negligatur, et cantor minister Deum moribus stimulet cum populum vocibus delectat.

[2] Compare Neanders Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Gesch. des Christenthums, Bd. 3. Heft 1. (Berlin 1824) S. 132 ff.

his great influence in the Western church he did much to introduce new absurdities in the mode of public worship, and perpetuate a host of superstitions.

The *relics of the saints* were now rapidly multiplied, sometimes by direct and barefaced imposture;[3] and were worshipped with the most fervent piety, frequently when nothing was known of those saints but their names.[4] Gregory gives the most absurd accounts of their wonderful power.[5]

Pictures began now to be more used in the churches, though even Gregory forbids worship to be paid to them.[6]

---

[3] *Gregor. M.* lib. IV. *Epist.* 30, *ad Constantinam* Aug.: Quidam Monachi Græci huc ante biennium venientes nocturno silentio juxta ecclesiam S. Pauli corpora mortuorum in campo jacentia effodiebant, atque eorum ossa recondebant, servantes sibi dum recederent. Qui cum tenti, et cur hoc facerent diligenter fuissent discussi, confessi sunt quod illa ossa ad Græciam essent tamquam Sanctorum reliquias portaturi. — An impostor in Gaul excited much attention by a sack full of reliques, which being examined, there were found amongst them, radices diversarum herbarum, dentes talpæ, ossa murium et ungues atque adipes ursinos. *Gregor. Tur.* IX. 6. — *Concil. Cæsaraugust.* 11. (592) can. 2: Statuit S. Synodus ut reliquiæ in quibuscunque locis de Ariana hæresi inventæ fuerint, prolatæ a Sacerdotibus, in quorum ecclesiis reperiuntur, pontificibus præsentatæ igne probentur (the ancient ordeal of the German nations).

[4] *Greg. M.* lib. VIII. ep. 29, see § 52, note 37.

[5] *Gregor. M.* lib. IV. ep. 30, *ad Constantinam Aug.*: Serenitas vestra — caput S. Pauli Apostoli aut aliud quid de corpore ipsius, suis ad se jussionibus a me præcepit debere transmitti. — Major me mœstitia tenuit, quod illa præcipitis, quæ facere nec possum, nec audeo. Nam corpora SS. Petri et Pauli App. tantis in Ecclesiis suis coruscant miraculis atque terroribus, ut neque ad orandum sine magno illuc timore possit accedi. — Examples. Amongst others, that at the opening of the grave of Laurentius monachi et mansionarii, qui corpus ejusdem Martyris viderunt, quod quidem minime tangere præsumserunt, omnes intra X dies defuncti sunt (Exod. xxxiii. 20). — Romanis consuetudo non est, quando Sanctorum reliquias dant, ut quidquam tangere præsumant de corpore: sed tantummodo in pyxide *brandeum* mittitur, atque ad sacratissima corpora Sanctorum ponitur. Quod levatum in Ecclesia, quæ est dedicanda, debita cum veneratione reconditur: et tantæ per hoc ibidem virtutes fiunt, ac si illuc specialiter eorum corpora deferantur (so also *Gregor. Turon.* de gloria Martyr. I. 28). Unde contigit, ut b. recordationis Leonis P. temporibus, sicut a majoribus traditur, dum quidam Græci de talibus reliquiis dubitarent, prædictus Pontifex hoc ipsum brandeum allatis forficibus inciderit, et ex ipsa incisione sanguis effluxerit. In Romanis namque vel totius Occidentis partibus omnino intolerabile est atque sacrilegum, si Sanctorum corpora tangere quisquam fortasse voluerit. Quod si præsumserit, certum est, quia hæc temeritas impunita nullo modo remanebit. — Sed quia serenissimæ Dominæ tam religiosum desiderium esse vacuum non debet, de catenis, quas ipse S. Paulus Ap. in collo et in manibus gestavit, ex quibus multa miracula in populo demonstrantur, partem aliquam vobis transmittere festinabo, si tamen hanc tollere limando prævaluero. Namely, quibusdam petentibus, diu per catenas ipsas ducitur lima, et tamen ut aliquid exinde exeat non obtinetur. — Lib. IX. Ep. 122, ad Recharedum Wisigoth. Regem: Clavem vero parvulam a sacratissimo b. Petri Ap. corpore vobis pro ejus benedictione transmisimus, in qua inest ferrum de catenis ejus inclusum; ut quod collum illius ad martyrium ligaverat, *vestrum ab omnibus peccatis solvat.* Crucem quoque dedi latori præsentium vobis offerendam in qua lignum Dominicæ crucis inest, et capilli b. Joannis Baptistæ. Ex qua semper solatium nostri Salvatoris per intercessionem præcursoris ejus habeatis. cf. Lib. III. Ep. 33. "See the writings of Gregory of Tours († A. D. 595) De gloria Martyrum libb. II. De gloria Confessorum lib. I. De virtutibus et miraculis I. Martini libb. IV. De vitis Patrum lib. I., all in the Bibl. PP. Leyden, T. XI."

Magnificent churches were built by Justinian.[7]

To the *festivals* were added the two feasts of the Virgin, *festum purificationis* on the 2d of February, and *festum annunciationis* on the 25th of March.[8]

On the three days before the ascension Mamercus, or Mamertius, bishop of Vienna (A. D. 452) had instituted solemn rites of prayer and penance, accompanied by fasting and public worship (litaniæ, rogationes).[9] To this festival Gregory added new ceremonies (litania septiformis).[10] He also made some improvements in the church music (cantus Gregorianus).[11]

The idea of a *spiritual relationship* between the god-father and the god-child first occurs in the laws of Justinian.[12]

The rules for administering the sacrament of the Supper were established by Gregory in his *Sacramentarium* nearly as they are now preserved.[13] The notions of the importance of this rite, and of

---

[6] *Lib.* IX. *Ep.* 105, *ad Serenum Massiliensem Ep.*: Præterea indico dudum ad nos pervenisse, quod Fraternitas vestra, quosdam imaginum adoratores adspiciens, easdem in Ecclesiis imagines confregit atque projecit. Et quidem zelum vos, ne quid manufactum adorari posset, habuisse laudavimus, sed frangere easdem imagines non debuisse indicamus. Idcirco enim pictura in Ecclesiis adhibetur, ut hi, qui litteras nesciunt, saltem in parietibus videndo legant, quæ legere in codicibus non valent. Tua ergo Fraternitas et illas servare, et ab earum adoratu populum prohibere debuit: quatenus et litterarum nescii haberent, unde scientiam historiæ colligerent, et populus in picturæ adoratione minime peccaret. *Lib.* XI. *Ep.* 13, *ad eundem:* quod de scriptis nostris, quæ ad te misimus, dubitasti, quam sis incautus apparuit. Amplification of the above. Amongst other things. Frangi ergo non debuit, quod non ad adorandum in ecclesiis, sed ad instruendas *solummodo* mentes fuit nescientium collocatum. cf. *Lib.* IX. *Ep.* 52, *ad secundinum:* Imagines, quas tibi dirigendas per Dulcidum Diaconum rogasti, misimus. Unde valde nobis tua postulatio placuit: quia illum toto corde, tota intentione quæris, cujus imaginem præ oculis habere desideras, ut te visio corporalis quotidiana reddat exercitatum: ut dum picturam illius vides, ad illum animo inardescas, cujus imaginem videre desideras. Ab re non facimus, si per visibilia invisibilia demonstramus. — Scio quidem, quod imaginem Salvatoris nostri non ideo petis, ut quasi Deum colas, sed ob recordationem filii Dei in ejus amore recalescas, cujus te imaginem videre desideras. Et nos quidem non quasi ante divinitatem ante illam prosternimur, sed illum adoramus, quem per imaginem aut natum, aut passum, sed et in throno sedentem recordamur.

[7] *Procopius Cæsariensis* de ædificiis Justiniani libb. VI.

[8] *Bingham*, vol. IX. p. 170 seq. *J. A. Schmidii prolusiones Marianæ sex, cum præf. J. L. Moshemii. Helmst.* 1733. 4to. p. 116 seq.; 103 seq.

[9] *Sidonius Apollinaris* Ep. Arvernorum († 482) Epistolarum lib. VII. Ep. 1. lib. V. Ep. 14. *Gregor. Tur.* II. 34. *Bingham*, vol. V. p. 21.

[10] Appendix ad Gregorii Epistolas, no. III. and Sermo tempore mortalitatis (in the older edition, lib. XI. Ep. 2).

[11] *Joannes Diac. de vit. Gregorii*, lib. II. c. 7. *Martin. Gerbert de cantu et musica sacra (Bambergæ et Frib.* 1774. II. T. 4to.), T. I. p. 35 seq.

[12] *Codex* Lib. V. tit. 4, *de nuptiis* L. 26: — Ea persona omnimodo ad nuptias venire prohibenda, quam aliquis — a sacrosancto suscepit baptismate: cum nihil aliud sic inducere potest paternam affectionem et justam nuptiarum prohibitionem, quam hujusmodi nexus, per quem Deo mediante animæ eorum copulatæ sunt. The relation was looked upon as a kind of adoption, see *du Fresne Glossar. s. v. Adoptio* and *Filiolatus.*

[13] *Jo. Bona rerum liturg.* Libb. II. Colon. 1674. 8vo. and many other editions, the best in his *Opp. omnibus Antverp.* 1723. fol. *Th. Christ. Lilienthal de canone Missæ Gregoriano, Lugd. Bat.* 1740. 8vo.

its atoning power, became more exaggerated in proportion as the idea became general, which was first suggested by Augustine, that men would be subjected to a purifying fire as soon as they left this world.[14] Gregory did much to confirm this view of the subject by his descriptions of the tortures of departed spirits, and their alleviation by the offering of the '*hostiæ*.'[15] In proportion as such notions of the mysterious nature of this rite became general, the people at large shrank from partaking in it, so that it was necessary for the church to pass laws on the subject.[16] In the notions concerning the nature of the elements there was no change.[17]

---

[14] Entirely distinct from the purifying fire of the last day, the belief in which had been very general since Origen, and in which *August.* also de civ. Dei XX. 25, seems to believe apparere in illo judicio quasdam quorundam purgatorias pœnas futuras. On the other hand, in the *Liber de* VIII *quæstionibus ad Dulcitium*, § 13: Tale aliquid (ignis, tribulationis tentatio) etiam post hanc vitam fieri incredibile non est, et utrum ita sit, quæri potest, et aut inveniri aut latere, nonnullos fideles per ignem quendam purgatorium, quanto magis minusve bona pereuntia dilexerunt, tanto tardius citiusve salvari. *De civ. Dei* XXI. 26: Post istius sane corporis mortem, donec ad illum veniatur, qui post resurrectionem corporum futurus est damnationis et remunerationis ultimus dies, si hoc temporis intervallo spiritus defunctorum ejusmodi ignem dicuntur perpeti, — non redarguo, quia forsitan verum est. *Dallæi de pœnis et satisfactionibus humanis* libb. VII. *Amst.* 1649. 4to. *J. G. Chr. Hæpfner de origine dogmatis Rom. Pontific. de purgatorio. Hal.* 1792. 8vo. Münschers Dogmengeschichte Th. 4. S. 425.

[15] *Greg. M.* Dialog. lib. IV. c. 39: Qualis hinc quisque egreditur, talis in judicio præsentatur. Sed tamen de quibusdam levibus culpis esse ante judicium purgatorius ignis credendus est, pro eo quod veritas dicit, quia *si quis in S. Spiritu blasphemiam dixerit, neque in hoc seculo remittetur ei, neque in futuro* (Matth. xii. 31). In qua sententia datur intelligi, quasdam culpas in hoc seculo, quasdam vero in futuro posse laxari. — Examples of such tormented souls, Ibid. II. 23; IV. 40; especially IV. 55: Si culpæ post mortem insolubiles non sunt, multum solet animas etiam post mortem sacra oblatio hostiæ salutaris adjuvare, ita ut hanc nonnumquam ipsæ defunctorum animæ expetere videantur, here two examples. Here the naive question of Peter (IV. 40): Quid hoc est, quæso, quod in his extremis temporibus tam multa de animabus clarescunt, quæ ante latuerunt: ita ut apertis revelationibus atque ostensionibus venturum sæculum inferre se nobis atque aperire videatur? To which Gregory rejoins (c. 41); Ita est: nam quantum præsens sæculum propinquat ad finem, tantum futurum sæculum ipsa jam quasi propinquitate tangitur, et signis manifestioribus aperitur.

[16] *Conc. Agathense* (A. D. 506) can. 18: Sæculares, qui natale domini, pascha et pentecostem non communicaverint, catholici non credantur, nec inter catholicos habeantur.

[17] *Gelasius* P. de duabus in Christo naturis adv. Eutychen et Nestorium (cited as genuine by his contemporaries *Gennadius* de script. c. 94, and *Fulgentius Rusp.* in Epist. XIV. ad Fulgentium Ferrandum cap. 19, in Gallandii bibl. T. XI. p. 334, which sufficiently confutes the doubts of Baronius, Bellarminus, and others. The work is found in the Bibl. PP., in Heroldi hæreseologia. Basil. 1556. fol. p. 683 etc.): Certe sacramenta, quæ sumimus, corporis et sanguinis Christi, divina res est, propter quod et per eadem divinæ efficimur consortes naturæ, et tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis et vini. Et certe imago et similitudo corporis et sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur. Satis ergo nobis evidenter ostenditur, hoc nobis in ipso Christo Domino sentiendum, quod in ejus imagine profitemur, celebramus et sumimus, ut sicut in hanc, scilicet in divinam, transeant Spiritu S. perficiente substantiam permanente tamen in sua proprietate natura, sic illud ipsum mysterium principale, cujus nobis efficientiam virtutemque veraciter repræsentant. *Facundus Hermian. pro defens.* III. *capitul.* IX. 5: Nam sacramentum adoptionis suscipere dignatus est Christus, et quando circumcisus est, et quando baptizatus est; et potest sacramentum adoptionis adoptio nun-

CHAPTER SIXTH.

SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY AND ITS CONDITION WITHOUT THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

I. IN ASIA AND AFRICA.

§ 120.

During the reign of Justinian I. the nations dwelling on the Black Sea were converted to the Christian religion, by the missionaries of the orthodox church. But this was far surpassed by the success of the Nestorians and Monophysites in these regions.

The Nestorians[1] not only maintained themselves in *Persia*, where they enjoyed the exclusive favor of the king (see § 87), but spread their doctrines on all sides, carrying them into *Arabia*[2] and *India*,[3] and it is said, in the year 636, even as far as *China*.[4]

The Monophysites, on the other hand, spread themselves from Alexandria towards the South. Among the *Hamjars* or *Homerites* Christianity had been early introduced (see § 105), though it did not become general till the time of the emperor Anastasius.[5] Afterwards,

---

cupari, sicut sacramentum corporis et sanguinis ejus, quod est in pane et poculo consecrato, corpus ejus et sanguinem dicimus: non quod proprie corpus ejus sit panis, et poculum sanguis: sed quod in se mysterium corporis ejus et sanguinis contineant. Hinc et ipse Dominus benedictum panem et calicem, quem discipulis tradidit, corpus et sanguinem suum vocavit. Cramers Forts. v. Bossuet Th. 5. Bd. 1. S. 200 ff. (Compare § 99, note 9. Tr.)

[1] Concerning them, comp. especially *Jos. Sim. Assemani diss. de Syris Nestorianis*, T. III. P. II. of the *Biblioth. orientalis.*

[2] *Assemanus* l. c. p. 607 seq.

[3] *Cosmas Indicopleustes* (about A. D. 535) *christ. Topogrophie lib.* III. says that ἐν τῇ Ταπροβάνῃ νήσῳ ἐν τῇ ἑσωτέρᾳ Ἰνδίᾳ there is a Christian church, (namely, lib. XI.: ἐκκλησία τῶν ἐπιδημούντων Περσῶν χριστιανῶν with a πρεσβύτερος ἀπὸ Περσίδος χειροτονούμενος): οὐκ οἶδα δὲ εἰ καὶ πέραιτέρω. So too in Male. But ἐν τῇ Καλλιάνᾳ — ἐπίσκοπός ἐστιν ἀπὸ Περσίδος χειροτονούμενος. So also ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τῇ καλουμένῃ Διοσκορίδου. — Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ Βάκτροις, καὶ Οὔννοις, καὶ Πέρσαις, καὶ λοιποῖς Ἰνδοῖς, καὶ Περσαρμενίοις, καὶ Μήδοις, καὶ Ἐλαμίταις, καὶ πάσῃ τῇ χώρᾳ Περσίδος καὶ ἐκκλησίαι ἄπειροι, καὶ ἐπίσκοποι, καὶ χριστιανοὶ λαοὶ πάμπολλοι κ. τ. λ. This is probably the origin of the *Christiani S. Thomæ*, discovered in Malabar by the Portuguese in the 16th century, cf. *Assemanus* l. c. p. 435 seq. (In the year 780 all the Persian Christians, among whom belonged those in India, declared themselves *discipulos Thomæ Apostoli*, see *Abulpharagius* in *Assem.* l. c. p. 438).

[4] That is, if the *Monumentum Syro-Sinicum* is genuine, which is said to have been erected, A. D. 781, and discovered A. D. 1625, in Sanxuen, near Siganfu, copies of the inscription thereon being sent to Europe by the Jesuit missionaries. First published in *Athanas. Kircheri Prodromus Copticus. Rom.* 1636. 4to. p. 74, and in *ejusdem China illustrata ibid.* 1667. fol. p. 43 seq. Comp. *Assemanus* l. c. p. 538 ff. Pfeiffers Auszug aus Assemans orient. Bibl. S. 492 ff.

[5] *Theodori Lect. hist. eccl.* II. where they are called Ἰμμιρηνοί.

however, the Christians of this country were violently persecuted by one of their kings, who was a Jew (A. D. 522); but were relieved by the help of an Ethiopian king, and a Christian, by name Abraham, put upon the throne.[6] As these Christians were Monophysites, the Monophysite doctrines were carried to other parts of Arabia.[7] During the reign of Justinian, the *Nubians* also were converted to Christianity by the Monophysites of Alexandria.[8]

II. AMONGST THE GERMAN NATIONS.

G. J. Plancks Geschichte der christl. kirchl. Gesellschaftsverfassung, Band. 2te.

§ 121.

The first German nation converted to the Christianity of the Catholic church were the Franks, who since the year 486 had been masters of the greatest part of Gaul. Clovis, king of the Salii, influenced by his queen Clotila, and the supposed effects of a vow made at the battle of Tolbiacum (A. D. 496), was baptized by Remigius, bishop of Rheims, and the whole nation followed his example.[1] From the Franks Christianity was propagated amongst the Allemanni, who were subject to them.[2]

Through the influence of this powerful nation also the doctrines of the orthodox church began gradually to spread amongst their Arian neighbours.[3] They were first adopted by the Burgundians in

---

[6] Comp. the differing accounts of the contemporaries *Johannes Episc. Asiæ* in *Assemani bibl. orient.* T. I. p. 359 seq. (Pfeiffers Auszug S. 105) and *Procopius de bello Persico* I. c. 17 and 20. *Chr. G. F. Walchii hist. rerum in Homeritide seculo sexto cum a Rege Judæo contra Christianos, tum ab Habessinis ad hos ulciscendos gestarum*, in the *Novis Commentariis Soc. Reg. Gottingensis* T. IV. *Commentt. hist. et philol.* p. 1 seq.

[7] *Assemani bibl. Orient.* T. III. P. II. p. 605. The Arab tribes, amongst whom Christianity was carried, are mentioned in *Ed. Pocockii spec. hist. Arabum, Oxon.* 1650. 4to. p. 136 seq. (new ed. by *Jos. White. Oxon.* 1806. p. 141 seq.)

[8] *Abulpharagius in Assem. bibl. Orient.* T. II. p. 330. Comp. *Letronne nouvel examen crit. et hist. de l'inscription grecque du roi nubien Silco, considerée dans ses rapports avec la propagation de la langue grecque et l'introduction du christianisme parmi les nations de la Nubie et de l'Abyssinie.* In the *Journal des Savans*, A. D. 1825. p. 97, especially p. 230.

[1] *Gregorii Turonensis* († 595) historiæ Francorum (libb. 10 to A. D. 591, best ed. in Dom Martin Bouquet rerum Gallicarum et Francicarum scriptores. Tom. II. Paris. 1739. fol.) lib. II. c. 28–31. Tradition of a flask of oil's being brought by a dove found first in *Hincmar* in vita Remigii cap. 3. The Ampulla itself was first visible at the coronation of Philip II. and was broken in the year 1794. Comp. *de Vertot diss. au sujet de la sainte ampulle* (Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscr. T. II. Mém. p. 669). E. G. v. Murr über die heil. Ampulle in Rheims. Nürnberg and Altdorf, 1801. 8vo.

[2] Sosimus, first bishop of Augsburg, A. D. 582.

[3] Gesch. des Arianismus unter den deutschen Völkern in Walchs Ketzerhist. Th. 2. S. 553 ff.

the year 517, by the Suevi, about the year 558, and by the Visigoths at the council of Toledo (A. D. 589). Also in Africa and in the north of Italy the destruction of the kingdom of the Vandals (A. D. 534), and of the Ostrogoths (A. D. 553), under Justinian, brought about the downfall of Arianism.

Under the Lombards, however (from the year 568) Arianism again revived in Italy, and it was among this people that it was longest maintained.[4]

The conversion of the Anglo-Saxons in Britain began at the end of our period. Augustine, being sent thither by Gregory the Great (A. D. 596), was first received by Ethelbert, king of Kent, through the influence of his queen Bertha, who was by birth a Frank. From Kent Christianity was gradually diffused throughout all the kingdoms of the Anglo-Saxons.[5]

§ 122.

HIERARCHY IN THE GERMAN CHURCH.

Eugen Montags Gesch. der deutschen staatsbürgerl. Freyheit (Bamb. u. Wurzb. 1812. 8vo.) Bd. 1. Th. 1. S. 205 ff. Th. 2. S. 1 ff. — K. F. Eichhorns deutsche Staats- u. Rechts- geschichte (2te Aufl. Göttingen 1818.) Th. 1. S. 243 ff. 281 ff.

Although the ecclesiastical laws of the Roman empire had been approved and adopted in the German church,[1] the relations of the hierarchy were not precisely the same. The church was now endowed with extensive estates;[2] the bishops became the vassals (ministeriales) of the kings, were often employed in the affairs of the state, and were thus invested with no inconsiderable political consequence. The possessions of the church were gradually freed from all taxes, though not from military service,[3] which was in some instances rendered by the bishops in person.[4] The kings regarded the lands of

---

[4] *Paulus Warnefridi*, Diaconus (about A. D. 774): de gestis Longobardorum libb. VI. (best ed. in Muratori Scriptor. Italic. Tom. 1. Mediol. 1723. fol.)

[5] *Beda Venerabilis* († 735) historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum libb. V. (ed *Fr. Chifletius. Paris*, 1681. 4to. *Joh. Smith. Cantabrig.* 1722. fol.)

[1] According to the German custom of allowing conquered nations to live according to their own law (*Lex Ripuariorum Tit.* LVIII. § 1: Legem Romanam, qua Ecclesia vivit). Comp. Eichhorn l. c. Th. 1. S. 74 ff. 122 ff.

[2] *Gregor. Turon. hist. Franc.* VI. 46: Chilperich, king in Soissons (A. D. 561 – 584) aiebat plerumque: Ecce pauper remansit fiscus noster, ecce divitiæ nostræ ad Ecclesias sunt translatæ: nulli penitus nisi soli Episcopi regnant: periit honor noster, et translatus est ad Episcopos civitatum. Comp. Hüllmanns Gesch. des Ursprungs der Stände in Deutschland (drei Theile 1806) Th. 1. S. 94 f.

[3] Planck Bd. 2. S. 222. Hüllmann Th. 1. S. 97. Montag Bd. 1. Th. 1. S. 314.

[4] In a battle against the Lombards (A. D. 572) there were the bishops Salonius

the church as feudal tenures (beneficia), and on some occasions did not scruple to resume them.[5] It was stipulated by the law that the choice of a bishop should be confirmed by the king;[6] but it was in fact, for the most part, *made* by him.[7] The synods could not assemble without the royal permission, their decrees must be confirmed by the king, and were published by him as laws. The affairs of the church, however, were now also brought before the national assemblies, and more particularly the king's council (Placitum regis, Synodia regia, Synodale concilium).[8] The synods became more and more rare, and at length were altogether discontinued.

This arrangement completed the downfall of the tottering metropolitan system. The bishops were now subject to none but the royal authority.[9] In proportion as they grew more powerful, however, the inferior clergy became more insignificant. As it was forbidden for any free man to enter the church without the especial permission of the king, the inferior clergy were for the most part taken from amongst the serfs. The natural tendency of this was to make the

---

and Sagittarius, qui non cruce cælesti muniti, sed galea aut lorica sæculari armati, multos manibus propriis, quod pejus est, interfecisse referuntur. *Gregor. Turon.* IV. 43 (al. 37).

[5] *Conc. Arvernense* (at Clermont) ann. 535. c. 5: Qui reiculam ecclesiæ petunt a regibus, et horrendæ cupiditatis impulsu legentium substantiam rapiunt; irrita habeantur quæ obtinent, et a communione ecclesiæ, cujus facultatem auferre cupiunt, excludantur. Comp. *Conc. Parisiens.* (about 557) against those qui facultates ecclesiæ, sub specie largitatis regiæ, improba subreptione pervaserint. Planck Bd. 2. S. 206. Hüllmann Th. 1. S. 95, 138.

[6] *Conc. Aurelian.* V. ann. 549, c. 10: cum voluntate regis, juxta electionem cleri ac plebis — a metropolitano — cum comprovincialibus pontifex consecretur.

[7] e. g. *Gregor. Turon.* de SS. Patrum vita c. 3 de S. Gallo: Tunc etiam et Apronculus Treverorum episcopus transiit. Congregatique clerici civitatis illius ad Theodericum regem (king of Austrasia 511 – 534) S. Gallum petebant episcopum. Quibus ille ait: Abscedite et alium requirite, Gallum enim diaconum alibi habeo destinatum. Tunc eligentes S. Nicetium episcopum acceperunt. Arverni vero clerici consensu insipientium facto cum multis muneribus ad regem venerunt. Jam tunc germen illud iniquum cœperat pullulare, ut sacerdotium aut venderetur a regibus, aut compararetur a clericis. Tunc ii audiunt a rege, quod S. Gallum habituri essent episcopum. — The *Concil. Paris. ann.* 615, wished indeed *can.* 1, to restore the choice by canons: but Chlotarius II. modified their decree as follows, (*Mansi* X. p. 543): Episcopo decedente in loco ipsius, qui a metropolitano ordinari debet cum provincialibus, a clero et populo eligatur; et si persona condigna fuerit, per ordinationem principis ordinetur: vel certe si de palatio eligitur, per meritum personæ et doctrinæ ordinetur. Comp. the formula in Marculfus (about 660. *formularum libb.* II. in *Baluzii capitularia* T. I. and in *Walter corpus juris Germ. antiqua* T. III. p. 285 seq.) L. I. c. 5. Præceptum Regis de Episcopatu c. 6. Indiculus Regis ad Episcopum, ut alium benedicat.

[8] Just. F. Runde Abhandlung v. Ursprung der Reichstandschaft d. Bischöfe u. Aebte, Göttingen, 1775. 4to. Herder, zur Philosophie u. Gesch. Carlsruher Ausg. Th. 13. S. 219. Planck Bd. 2. S. 126. Hüllman Th. 1. S. 231 ff. Eichhorn Th. 1. S. 281. Montag Bd. 1. Th. 2. S. 54 ff.

[9] Gregorious Turon. says to king Chilperich: Si quis de nobis, o Rex, justitiæ tramitem transcendere voluerit, a te corrigi potest: si vero tu excesseris, quis te corripiet? Loquimur enim tibi, sed si volueris, audis: si autem nolueris, quis te condemnabit, nisi is qui se pronunciavit esse justitiam? *Gregor. Tur.* hist. Franc. V. 19.

power of the bishops more arbitrary, and they were sometimes guilty of the most tyrannical conduct.[10] The administration of justice amongst the clergy was conducted according to the laws which had been established by Constantine (see § 89, note 3),[11] until at the synod of Paris (A. D 615) the privilege was granted the clergy of bringing such cases as had hitherto been tried by the civil courts before a mixed court of laity and clergy.[12] A wider influence was given to the bishops by committing to them the general superintendence of the administration of justice;[13] whilst their ecclesiastical punishments were made more effectual by connecting with them the loss of certain civil privileges.[14] Still in the application of their discipline they were bound to regard the interference of the king.[15]

Under these circumstances the popes had but little opportunity to interfere directly in the concerns of the German church, and their communication with the individual churches depended entirely upon the royal pleasure.[16]

---

[10] E. g. *Concil. Carpentoractense* (527): hujusmodi ad nos querela pervenit, quod ea quæ a quibuscunque fidelibus parochiis conferuntur, ita ab aliquibus episcopis præsumantur, ut aut parum, aut prope nihil ecclesiis, quibus collata fuerant, relinquatur. *Concil. Toletanum* III. (589) capitul. 20: cognovimus episcopos per parochias suas non sacerdotaliter deservire, sed crudeliter desævire.

[11] Planck Bd. 2. S. 161 ff. Montag Bd. 1. Th. 2. S. 106 ff. *Schilling* de orig. jurisdictionis eccles. in causis civilibus. Lips. 1825. 4to. p. 46 seq.

[12] In the edict of Clotarii II. confirming this Synod we have: Ut nullus judicum de quolibet ordine clericos de civilibus causis, præter criminalia negotia, per se distringere aut damnare præsumat, nisi convincitur manifestus excepto presbytero aut diacono. Qui vero convicti fuerint de crimine capitali, juxta canones distringantur, et cum pontificibus examinentur. Compare Planck Bd. 2. S. 165 ff.

[13] *Clotarii Regis constitutio generalis*, A. D. 560 (in *Baluzii Capitularia Regum Franc.* vol. I. p. 7. *Walter Corpus juris Germ. ant.* T. II. p. 2): VI. Si judex aliquem contra legem injuste damnaverit, in nostri absentia ab Episcopis castigetur, ut quod perpere judicavit, versatim melius discussione habita emendare procuret. *Conc. Toletanum* III. (589) cap. 18: — judices locorum vel actores fiscalium patrimoniorum ex decreto gloriosissimi domini nostri simul cum sacerdotali concilio autumnali tempore die Kal. Nov. in unum conveniant, ut discant, quam pie et juste cum populis agere debeant, ne in angariis aut in operationibus superfluis sive privatum honorent, sive fiscalem gravent. Sunt enim prospectores episcopi secundum regiam admonitionem, qualiter judices cum populis agant: ita ut ipsos præmonitos corrigant, aut insolentias eorum auditibus principis innotescant. Quodsi correptos emendare nequiverint, et ab ecclesia et a communione suspendant.

[14] *Decretio Childeberti Regis* A. D. 595: II. — Qui vero Episcopum suum noluerit audire, et excommunicatus fuerit, perennem condemnationem apud Deum sustineat, et insuper de palatio nostro sit omnino extraneus, et omnes facultates suas parentibus legitimis amittat, qui noluit sacerdotis sui medicamenta sustinere.

[15] *Conc. Parisiense* V. (A. D. 615) can. 3: Ut si quis clericus — contemto episcopo suo ad principem vel ad potentiores homines — ambularit, vel sibi patronos elegerit, non recipiatur, præter ut veniam debeat promereri. Chlotar II. repeats and confirms this edictum: Et si pro qualibet causa principem expetierit, et cum ipsius principis epistola ad episcopum suum fuerit reversus, excusatus recipiatur.

[16] Thus Pelagius I. was at the greatest pains to defend himself to king Childebert against the suspicion of heresy, which he had drawn upon himself by condemning the three chapters. *Pelagii* I. *Ep.* 16, *ad Childeb. Reg.* (*Mansi* IX. p. 728): if no offence, he says, is to be given even to the little ones, quanto nobis studio ac labore satagendum est, ut pro auferendo suspicionis scan-

§ 123.

MORAL INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY AMONGST THE GERMAN NATIONS.

It would hardly be reasonable to expect that Christianity should have exerted any great moral influence upon the German nations at a time, when, itself already encumbered with various corruptions, it had to contend with an untamed barbarity; whilst its public services, being conducted in a foreign tongue, could at best awaken only obscure feelings, without imparting any real instruction. The grossest and most absurd ideas were entertained of hell-torments, of the power of the church, of the influence of the saints, of the worth of monkish practices, and of the merit of charity to the church and the poor.[1] These notions were strengthened by legends and miracles,

---

dalo obsequium confessionis nostræ regibus ministremus; quibus nos etiam subditos esse sanctæ scripturæ præcipiunt? Veniens etenim Rufinus vir magnificus, legatus excellentiæ vestræ, confidenter a nobis, ut decuit, postulavit, quatenus vobis aut beatæ recordationis papæ Leonis tomum a nobis per omnia conservari significare debuissemus, aut propriis verbis nostræ confessionem fidei destinare. Et primam quidem petitionis ejus partem, quia facilior fuit, mox ut dixit, implevimus. — Ut autem nullius deinceps, quod absit, suspicionis resideret occasio, etiam illam aliam partem, quam memoratus vir illustris Rufinus admonuit, facere mutavi, scilicet propriis verbis confessionem fidei, quam tenemus, exponens. Then follows a diffuse confession of faith, in which, however, he mentions only four œcumenical Synods, not the 5th. Herewith he writes also to *Sapaudus Episc. Arelat.* (*Ep.* 15, l. c. p. 727) praying, ut, si epistola, quam — ad — Childebertum regem direximus, in qua de institutis beatissimorum patrum nostrorum fidem catholicam nostro per Dei gratiam sermone deprompsimus, tam ipsi gloriosissimo regi, quam caritati tuæ, vel aliis fratribus coëpiscopis nostris placuit, rescripto tuæ caritatis celerius agnoscamus. cf. *Preuves des libertés de l'église Gallicane*, c. 2. Planck, Bd. 2. S. 673 ff.

[1] cf. *Vita S. Eligii Episc. Noviomensis* libb. III. A. D. 672, written by his contemporary Audoënus Archiep. Rotomag., in *Luc. d'Achery Spicilegium* ed. II. Tom. II. p. 76 seq. Eligius, bishop of Noyon, was considered a man of extraordinary sanctity (*Vitæ* lib. II. c. 6. p. 92: Huic itaque viro sanctissimo inter cætera virtutum suarum miracula id etiam a Domino concessum erat, ut sanctorum Martyrum corpora, quæ per tot sæcula abdita populis hactenus habebantur, eo investigante ac nimio ardore fidei indagante patefacta proderentur: siquidem nonnulla venerabantur prius a populo in locis, quibus non erant, et tamen quo in loco certius humata tegerentur, prorsus ignorabatur). The more remarkable therefore his exhortation, contained *Vitæ* lib. II. c. 15. p. 96 seq. After referring to the day of judgment, and the great points of faith, he adverts to the duty of performing opera Christiana, and continues thus: Ille itaque bonus Christianus est, qui nulla phylacteria, vel adinventiones diaboli credit. — Ille, inquam, bonus Christianus est, qui hospitibus pedes lavat, et tamquam parentes carissimos diligit; qui juxta quod habet pauperibus eleemosynam tribuit; qui ad Ecclesiam frequentius venit, et oblationem quæ in altari Deo offeratur exhibet; qui de fructibus suis non gustat, nisi prius Deo aliquid offerat; qui stateras dolosas et mensuras duplices non habet; qui pecuniam suam non dedit ad usuram; qui et ipse caste vivit, et filios vel vicinos docet, ut caste et cum timore Dei vivant; et quoties sanctæ solemnitates adveniunt, ante dies plures castitatem etiam cum propria uxore custodit, ut secura conscientia ad Domini altare accedere possit; qui postremo symbolum vel orationem Dominicam memoriter tenet, et filios ac filias eadem docet. Qui talis est, sine dubio verus Christianus est. — Ecce audistis, Fratres, quales sint Christiani boni: ideo quantum potestis cum Dei adjuratorio laborate, nomen Christianum non sit

to be ascribed, at least in part, to the impostures of the clergy,[2] but were far from exerting any good moral influence on the people.[3] The grossest crimes[4] were committed without disguise, and without reproof.[5] The moral influence of Christianity upon the multitude was seen only in the observance of church laws and church discipline, in as far as these were submitted to. Men were once more under the dominion of the law and not of the gospel.

Many heathen customs were Christianized that it might not be necessary to abolish them;[6] though such as were not susceptible of

---

falsum in vobis. Sed ut veri Christiani esse possitis, semper præcepta Christi et cogitate in mente, et implete in operatione. Redimite animas vestras de pœna, dum habetis in potestate remedia; eleemosynam juxta vires facite, pacem et charitatem habete, discordes ad concordiam revocate, mendacium fugite, perjurium expavescite, falsum testimonium non dicite, furtum non facite, oblationes et decimas Ecclesiis offerte, luminaria sanctis locis juxta quod habetis exhibete, symbolum et orationem Dominicam memoria retinete, et filiis vestris insinuate. — Ad Ecclesiam quoque frequentius convenite, Sanctorum patrocinia humiliter expetite, diem Dominicam pro reverentia resurrectionis Christi absque ullo servili opere colite, Sanctorum solemnitates pio affectu celebrate: proximos vestros sicut vos ipsos diligite, etc. — Quod si observaveritis, securi in die judicii ante tribunal æterni Judicis venientes dicetis: Da, Domine, quia dedimus; miserere, quia misericordiam fecimus; nos implevimus quod jussisti, tu redde quod promisisti.

[2] At least the Arians maintained that they had detected the Catholic clergy in such practices. Thus *Grogorius Turon. de glor. mart.* I. 25: Theodegisilus hujus rex regionis, cum vidisset hoc miraculum, quod in his sacratis Deo iontibus gerebatur, cogitavit intra se dicens, quia ingenium est Romanorum (Romanos enim vocitant homines nostræ religionis) ut ita accidat, et non est Dei virtus. c. 26: Est enim populus ille hæreticus, qui videns hæc magnalia non compungitur ad credendum, sed semper callide divinarum præceptionum sacramenta nequissimis interpretationum garrulationibus non desinit impugnare.

[3] *Gregory*, l. c. relates that, whilst the priest was filling a vessel with wonder-working water, the devout person for whom it was intended, manum alterius extendit ad balteum cultrumque furatus est. — How the holiest rites were sometimes made instrumental in crime, see an example in the words of the monster Fredegundis to the assassins, whom she had hired to murder king Sigbert (Gesta Regum Francorum, c. 32, in *Bouquet* Rerum Gallic. scriptores, T. II. p. 562): Si evaderitis vivi, ego mirifice honorabo vos et sobolem vestram: si autem corruceritis, ego pro vobis eleemosynas multas per loca Sanctorum distribuam.

[4] Assassination was a common occurrence, and the clergy themselves were sometimes the instruments, *Gregor. Tur.* hist. Franc. VII. 20; VIII. 29. — Several of the French kings lived in polygamy, Chlotar's two wives were sisters, *Gregor. Tur.* IV. 3. — Dagobert tres habebat ad instar Salomonis Reginas, maxime et plurimas concubinas. *Fredegarii* Chronicon, c. 60.

[5] Thus Greg. Tur. relates without disguise the crimes of Chlodowich, and yet says of him, II. 40: Prosternebat enim quotidie Deus hostes ejus sub manu ipsius, et augebat regnum ejus, eo quod ambularet recto corde coram eo, et faceret, quæ placita erant in oculis ejus. III. 1: Velim, si placet, parumper conferre, quæ Christianis beatam confitentibus Trinitatem prospera successerint, et quæ hæreticis eandem scindentibus fuerint in ruinam. — Hanc Chlodovechus Rex confessus, ipsos hæreticos adjutorio ejus oppressit, regnumque suum per totas Gallias dilatavit: Alaricus hanc denegans, a regno et populo, atque ab ipsa, quod majus est, vita multatur æterna.

[6] *Gregor. M.* lib. XI. Ep. 76. *ad Mellitum Abbatem* (also in *Bedæ* hist. eccl. Angl. I. 30): Cum vos Deus omnipotens ad — Augustinum Episcopum perduxerit, dicite ei, quid diu mecum de causa Anglorum cogitans tractavi, videlicet, quia fana idolorum destrui in eadem gente minime debeant, sed ipsa, quæ in eis sunt, idola destruantur. Aqua benedicta fiat, in eisdem fanis aspergatur, altaria con-

this modification were strictly prohibited. In the laws likewise all traces of paganism were by degrees expunged.[7] The only remains of it were seen in the great freedom of divorce,[8] and the continued use of the ordeal.[9]

---

struantur, reliquiæ ponantur: quia si fana eadem bene constructa sunt, necesse est ut a cultu dæmonum in obsequium veri Dei debeant commutari: ut dum gens ipsa eadem fana non videt destrui, de corde errorem deponat, et Deum verum cognoscens ac adorans, ad loca, quæ consuevit, familiarius concurrat. Et quia boves solent in sacrificio dæmonum multos occidere, debet his etiam hac de re aliqua solemnitas immutari: ut die dedicationis vel natalitiis SS. Martyrum, quorum illic reliquiæ ponuntur, tabernacula sibi circa easdem ecclesias, quæ ex fanis commutatæ sunt, de ramis arborum faciant, et religiosis conviviis solemnitatem celebrent. Nec diabolo jam animalia immolent, sed ad laudem Dei in esum suum animalia occidant, et donatori omnium de satietate sua gratias referant: ut dum eis aliqua exterius gaudia reservantur, ad interiora gaudia consentire facilius valeant. Nam duris mentibus simul omnia abscidere impossibile esse non dubium est: quia is qui locum summum adscendere nititur, necesse est ut gradibus vel passibus, non autem saltibus elevetur.

[7] On the history of ancient German law — the *Salic* digested under Chlodwig, the *Burgundian* under Gundobald, † 516, the *Ripuarian* under Theodoric, 511 – 534, the *Alemanic* under Chlotar II. 613 – 628, and the *Bavarian* under Chlotar II. or Dagobert I. 613 – 638, see Eichhorns deutsche Staats- u. Rechtsgesch. Th. 1. S. 94 ff. Editions of the laws in *Baluzii Capitularia Reg. Franc.* T. I. *J. P. Canciani Barbarorum leges antiquæ Venet.* 1781 – 92. 5 Tomi. fol. *Walter corp. juris Germ. ant.* T. I. cf. *Prologus Leg. Ripuar.* (in several edd. misprinted, Prol. Leg. Sal.:) Theodoricus Rex Francorum, cum esset Cathalaunis, elegit viros sapientes; — ipso autem dictante jussit conscribere Legem Francorum, Alamannorum et Bojoariorum, et unicuique Genti, quæ in ejus potestate erat, secundum consuetudinem suam: addiditque addenda, et improvisa et incomposita resecavit; et quæ erant secundum consuetudinem Paganorum, mutavit secundum legem Christianorum. Et quidquid Theodoricus Rex propter vetustissimam Paganorum consuetudinem emendare non potuit, posthæc Hildebertus rex inchoavit corrigere; sed Chlotharius rex perfecit. Hæc omnia Dagobertus rex — renovavit, et omnia veterum legum in melius transtulit; unicuique quoque Genti scriptam tradidit.

[8] By the *Lex Burgund. Tit.* 34. c. 3, the husband could put away an adulteram, malificam, vel sepulcrorum violatricem without ceremony: if he has not one of these excuses he must make her indemnification (c. 2. 4to., and *Lex Bajuvar. Tit.* VII. c. 14). By mutual consent, however, the parties could be divorced without any difficulty, see the formula in the *Formulis Andegavensibus* (from the 6th century, prim. ed. Mabillon Analect. T. IV. p. 234) c. 56, and *Marculfi formularum*, lib. II. c. 30. That in Marculf runs thus: libellus repudii: Certis rebus et probatis causis inter maritum et uxorem repudiandi locus patet. Idcirco dum et inter illo et conjuge sua illa non caritas secundum Deum, sed discordia regnat, et ob hoc pariter conversare minime possunt, placuit utriusque voluntas, ut se a consortio separare deberent. Quod ita et fecerunt. Propterea has epistolas inter se uno tenore conscriptas fieri et adfirmare decreverunt, ut unusquisque ex ipsis, sive ad servitium Dei in monasterio, aut ad copulam matrimonii se sociare voluerit, licentiam habeat, etc.

[9] Which was used even in questions pertaining to Christianity itself, compare Can. Cæsaraugust. § 119, note 3. — *Gregor. Tur. de glor. mart.* I. 81: Arianorum presbyter cum diacono nostræ religionis altercationem habebat. At ille — adjecit dicens: Quid longis sermocinationum intentionibus fatigamur? Factis rei veritas adprobetur: succendatur igni æneus, et in ferventi aqua annulus cujusdam projiciatur. Qui vero eum ex ferventi unda sustulerit, ille justitiam consequi comprobatur: quo facto pars diversa ad cognitionem hujus justitiæ convertatur, etc.

III. BRITISH CHURCH.

§ 124.

The British church from its situation had been unable to keep up an intimate connexion with the other churches, and thus had in many respects retained the peculiarities of earlier times.[1] Amongst the Britons themselves the invasion of the Anglo-Saxons had subverted all ecclesiastical as well as social order;[2] but the Irish church was still prosperous and flourishing. The Irish convents were distinguished for their discipline and their learning,[3] as well as their efforts to carry Christianity amongst their northern neighbours. The monk Columban in particular (from about the year 565, † A. D. 597) was very successful amongst the *Picts*.[4]

After Augustine had converted the Anglo-Saxons, he laid claim to the ecclesiastical supremacy over the whole country, as archbishop of Canterbury. This brought him into controversy with the bishops of the old church, partly on account of their mode of reckoning Easter,[5]

---

[1] Compare the few remains of the old British law in *Dav. Wilkins* Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ et Hiberniæ (from A. D. 446–1717. voll. IV. Londini, 1737. fol. I. p. 1–8.) There was no celibacy of priests, Synod. Patricii (about A. D. 456.) can 6: — uxor ejus (clerici) si non velato capite ambulaverit, pariter a laicis contemnatur et ab ecclesia separetur. (As late as the 8th century the marriage of a bishop was defended by an Irishman, Clemens. *Boniface* Epist. 67. Irish bishops were married as late as the 12th century, comp. *Bernhard*, in vita Malachiæ, c. 10.) — In the Appendix to the proceedings of this Synod, a certain Gildas says de abstinentia ciborum: Abstinentia corporalium ciborum absque charitate inutilis est; meliores sunt ergo, qui non magno opere jejunant, nec supra modum a creatura Dei se abstinent, cor intrinsecus nitidum coram Deo sollicite servantes, a quo sciunt exitum vitæ, quam illi, qui carnem non edunt, nec cibis secularibus delectantur, neque vehiculis equisque vehuntur, et pro his quasi superiores cæteris se putantes, quibus mors intrat per fenestram elevationis. Gildas de excidio Britanniæ, P. III. cap. 1, calls the priests sedem Petri Apostoli immundis pedibus usurpantes (comp. § 92, note 26).

[2] *Gildas Badonicus* (A. D. 560–580) de excidio Britanniæ liber querulus (in three parts historia — epistola — increpatio in clerum), best ed. in *Thom. Gale* historiæ Britannicæ, Saxon., Anglo-Danicæ Scriptores, XV. ex vetustis codd. mss. editi. Oxon. 1691, reprinted thence in *Gallandii* Bibl. PP. T. XII. p. 189 seq.

[3] *Jo. Ph. Murray de Britannia atque Hibernia sæculis a sexto inde ad decimum literarum domicilio* in the *Novis Commentariis Soc. Reg. Gotting.* T. I. *comm. hist. et philol.* p. 72 seq.

[4] *Beda hist. eccl.* III. 4.

[5] The Britons were by no means quartodecimani, as is frequently said, though in the course of the controversy they were often confounded with that sect, and even themselves appealed to John and the Asiatics. *Beda* hist. eccl. III. 4: paschæ diem non semper in luna quartadecima cum Judæis, ut quidam rebantur, sed in die quidem Dominica, alia tamen quam decebat hebdomada, celebrabant. Namely, II. 2: paschæ diem a decimaquarta usque ad vicesimam lunam observabant. Quæ computatio octoginta quatuor annorum circulo continetur. The Romans, on the other hand, (II. 19) adstruebant, quia Dominicum paschæ diem a quintadecima luna usque ad vicesimam primam lunam oporteret inquiri. The difference therefore was, that in *some years* the Easter festival fell on different days. The cause of this was, that owing to the confusion on the subject (see § 98)

and some other peculiarities of church discipline,[6] but more especially on account of their refusal to acknowledge the claims either of the bishop of Rome, or the new archbishop who appeared in his behalf.[7] As the Britons were still free, their bishops could not be compelled to submit, and the negotiations at the great synod near Wigornia (Worcester. Tr.) (A. D. 601), were worse than fruitless; the parties being only mutually embittered against each other.[8]

At this time Columban appeared in the kingdom of Burgundy (about the year 590), where he acquired great influence by his piety and learning, and founded several convents, among which was that of Luxovium (Luxeuil). Here he not only introduced a peculiar system of monastic rules, but also the peculiarities of his native church, and defended the Irish mode of celebrating Easter with great zeal.[9] At length he displeased king Theodoric II. by his boldness, and was banished about the year 606. After this he was employed for some years in the conversion of the Allemanni on the borders of the lake of Constance, until at length he transferred this task to his pupil Gallus, and founded the convent Bobium in a valley in the Apennines, where he inspired the same love of learning, for which the monks of his country had been so much distinguished.[10] He died in the year 615.[11] His letter to Gregory the Great on the sub-

---

the Aquitanian Victorius (A. D. 457), and the Roman abbot Dionysius Exiguus (A. D. 525) had made new tables, which in succession were brought into use, first in Italy and then in the other Western churches (see *Ideler's* Chronology, Bd. 2. S. 275 ff.), whilst the British church had retained the old Cyclus of 84 years. The true nature of the controversy is shown by *Jac. Asserius* Britannicarum ecclesiarum antiquitt. (ed. 2, Lond. 1687), p. 480 seq. *Prideaux* Conn. P. II. p. 273. *Ideler's* Chronology, Bd. 2. S. 295.

[6] cf. *Usserii Britann. eccl. antiquitt.* p. 474 seq.

[7] Beda who leaned to the side of Rome only hints at this: Sed et alia plurima unitati ecclesiæ contraria faciebant. But see the remarkable declaration of Dionoth, abbot of the convent Bangor, verbally translated in *Wilkins* Conc. M. Brit. vol. I. p. 26): Notum sit et absque dubitatione vobis, quod nos omnes sumus et quilibet nostrum obedientes et subditi ecclesiæ Dei, et papæ Romæ, et unicuique vero christiano et pio, ad amandum unumquemque in suo gradu in caritate perfecta, et ad juvandum unumquemque eorem verbo et facto fore filios Dei. Et aliam obedientiam, quam istam, non scio debitam ei, quem vos nominatis esse papam; nec esse patrem patrum vindicari et postulari: et istam obedientiam nos sumus parati dare et solvere ei et cuique Christiano continuo. Præterea nos sumus sub gubernatione espiscopi Caerlionis super Osca, qui est ad supervidendum sub Deo super nobis, ad faciendum nos servare viam spiritualem.

[8] Thus Augustine's successor Laurentius (Beda II. 4), complains of the Scotch bishop Dagamus ad nos veniens, non solum cibum nobiscum, sed nec in eodem hospitio, quo vescebamur, sumere voluit.

[9] *Columbani* epist. I. ad Gregor. Papam (amongst Gregory's letters lib. IX. ep. 127) and epist. 2 ad Patres Synodi cujusd. Gallicanæ.

[10] Whence the very important discoveries recently made, and contained in the scattered Codd. Bobiensibus, comp. *Amad. Peyron de Bibliotheca Bobiensi comm.* prefixed to his *Ciceronis Orationum fragmenta inedita. Stuttg. et Tubing.* 1824. 4to.

[11] Life by his pupil Jonas, abbot of Luxovium in *Mabillon* Acta Sanct. Ord. Bened. T. II. p. 3 seq. Neanders Denkwürdigk. Bd. 3. Heft. 2. S. 37 ff. — His writings *Regula cœnobialis*, Sermones XVI., Epistolæ VI. Carmina IV.), ed *Patricius Flemingus.* Lovanii 1667, recensita et aucta in *Gallandii* Bibl. PP. T. XII. p. 319 seq.

ject of the celebration of Easter, and that to Boniface concerning the condemnation of the three chapters remain to us as proofs of the freer spirit which pervaded the Irish church.[12]

---

[12] *Ep. ad Gregor.:* Forte notam subire timens Hermagoricæ novitatis, antecessorum et maxime Papæ Leonis auctoritate contentus es. Neli te quæso in tali quæstione humilitati tantum aut gravitati credere, quæ sæpe falluntur. Melior forte est canis vivus in problemate *Leone* mortuo (*Eccl.* IX. 4). Vivus namque sanctus emendare potest, quæ ab altero majore emendata non fuerint. — non mihi satisfacit post tantos quos legi auctores, una istorum sententia episcoporum dicentium tantum: "Cum Judæis Pascha facere non debemus." Dixit hoc olim et Victor episcopus, sed nemo orientalium suum recepit commentum. *Epist.* 5 *ad Bonifacium* IV. cap. 4: Vigila itaque quæso, Papa, vigila, et iterum dico, vigila: quia forte non bene vigilavit Vigilius, quem caput scandali isti clamant, qui vobis culpam injiciunt. c. 10: ex eo tempore, quo Deus et Dei filius esse dignatus est, ac in duobus illis ferventissimis Dei Spiritus equis, Petro scilicet et Paulo Apostolis — per mare gentium equitans, turbavit aquas multas, et innumerabilium populorum millibus multiplicavit quadrigas; supremus ipse auriga currus illius, qui est Christus, — ad nos usque pervenit. Ex tunc vos magni estis et clari, et Roma ipsa nobilior et clarior est; et, si dici potest, propter Christi geminos Apostolos — vos prope cælestes estis, et Roma orbis terrarum caput est ecclesiarum, *salva loci dominicæ resurrectionis singulari prærogativa* (comp. Firmilianus, § 66, note 9. Augustinus, § 92, note 5). Et ideo sicut magnus honor vester est pro dignitate cathedræ, ita magna cura vobis necessaria est, ut non perdatis vestram dignitatem propter aliquam perversitatem. Tamdiu enim potestas apud vos erit, quamdiu recta ratio permanserit: ille enim certus regni cœlorum clavicularius est, qui dignis per veram scientiam aperit, et indignis claudit. Alioquin, si contraria fecerit, nec aperire nec claudere poterit. c. 11: Cum hæc igitur vera sint, et sine ulla contradictione ab omnibus vera sapientibus recepta sint (licet omnibus notum est, et nemo est qui nesciat, qualiter Salvator noster sancto Petro regni cœlorum contulit claves (comp. Gildas, note 1), et vos per hoc forte superciliosum nescio quid, præ cæteris vobis majoris auctoritatis, ac in divinis rebus potestatis vindicatis); noveritis minorem fore potestatem vestram apud Dominum, si vel cogitatis hoc in cordibus vestris: quia unitas fidei in toto orbe unitatem fecit potestatis et prærogativæ; ita ut libertas veritati ubique ab omnibus detur, et aditus errori ab omnibus similiter abnegetur, etc.

THIRD DIVISION.

FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE MONOTHELETIC CONTROVERSY, AND FROM THE TIME OF MUHAMMED, TO THE BEGINNING OF THE CONTROVERSY CONCERNING THE WORSHIP OF IMAGES.

A. D. 622 — 726.

CHAPTER FIRST.

ENEMIES OF THE CHURCH IN THE EAST.

§ 125.

ALTHOUGH the Persians favored the Nestorians, they cherished the most bitter hatred of the orthodox Christians; as was particularly evident in the wars of Kesra (Chosroes) II. with the Eastern empire, from the year 604, and especially at the taking of Jerusalem (A. D. 614). On this account the victories of Heraclius from the year 621, ending with the deposition of Kesra, were of great importance for the church. Heraclius brought back also the wood of the true cross, which Kesra had carried off, and in commemoration of his exploit instituted a festival, called *festum exaltationis*, on the 14th of September.[1]

In the mean time a far more dangerous enemy of the church had appeared in Arabia. In the year 611 MUHAMMED * began to preach his religion, at first in private, and then publicly at Mecca. In the beginning he was forced to fly from his enemies (July 15, 622), but afterwards having gained over the city of Yatschreb (Medina al Nabi), he thence continued to extend his doctrines and his dominion together in Arabia, till at length he conquered Mecca (A. D. 630), consecrated the Caaba † as the chief temple of Islamism, and bequeathed to his successors, the Caliphs, undisputed rule over the whole country.[2]

---

[1] *Theophanis* Chronographia, p. 245 – 273, amongst other things he says, of the course pursued by Chosroes in the conquered countries, p. 263, ἠνάγκαζε τοὺς Χριστιανοὺς γενέσθαι εἰς τὴν τοῦ Νεστορίου θρησκείαν πρὸς τὸ πλῆξαι τὸν βασιλέα.

* [The familiar mode of writing this name *Mahomet* is perhaps on that very account the best, but in such a case it seems to be more appropriate to a translation to follow the original. Tr.]

† [*Caaba*, described in Bash's Life of Mohammed. App. B. Tr.]

[2] *Abulfeda* de vita Muhammedis ed. J. Gagnier. Oxon. 1723. fol. La vie de Mohammed par *J. Gagnier*. Amsterd. 1732. 2 voll. F. Th. Schlossers, Weltgeschichte, Bd. 2. (Frankf. a. M. 1817) S. 209 ff. — F. Rehms Geschichte des Mittelalters, Bd. 1. (Marburg, 1821) S. 359 ff. [In *Bush's Life of Mo-*

Islamism, as taught in the Koran,[3] is in its essential points a mixture of Judaism and Christianity. But by making it a religious duty to wage war on the Infidels, by its doctrine of Fatalism, and the sensual rewards[4] it held out to those who died in battle, it excited in that rude and fiery people a spirit of conquest and a wild valor, before which the neighbouring kingdoms, the Persian and the Byzantine, were swept away almost without resistance. The provinces of the Byzantine empire which lay nearest the Arabs were the more easily conquered, that the inhabitants were for the most part Monophysites, who looked on the Mahometans as their deliverers. The conquest of Syria was begun by the first caliph Abubeker († A. D. 634), and completed by his successor Omar (A. D. 639); by whose general Amru Egypt also was overrun (A. D. 640). Under Osman (A. D. 651), the Persian empire was conquered. During the reign of the Ommiades, their general Musa extended the Mahometan conquests over the whole northern coast of Africa (A. D. 707), as well as Spain (A. D. 711); whilst on the other side the Arabs advanced several times to the walls of Constantinople, and twice besieged the city for a long time (A. D. 669–676, and A. D. 717–718).

The Arabs tolerated all religions, exacting only a certain tax, and although the Christians were often much oppressed, they were never compelled to abandon their faith.[5] Still, however, the advantages held out to those who adopted Islamism, attracted many converts; and thus, whilst Christianity of course lost all political influence in the conquered provinces, the number of its professors was every day diminished. The patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria were now vacated, or filled only by titular patriarchs who resided in the Greek empire.

---

hammed, No. X. of Harper's Family Library, Appendix E., is a detailed account of the works which treat of this subject. Tr.]

[3] Arab. et Lat. ed. *Lud. Maraccius*, Patav. 1698. fol.

[4] Becks Darstellung der Lehren des Coran in his translation of Muradgea d'Ohsson Schilderung des othoman. Reichs (2 Bde. Leipz. 1788), Bd. I. S. 533 ff. — Amadeus Wiessner, der Muhammedanismus. Geschichte und Lehre des Islam, nach dem Koran der Sunna u. a. Quellen bearbeitet, Th. 1. Leipzig, 1823. 8vo.

[5] Muhammed was at first universally tolerant (cf. *Sura* II. and V.): afterwards, however, (*Sura* IX.) he made it the duty of believers to make war on the infidels, to the extermination of all idolaters, and the subjection of Jews and Christians. Before this he had granted the right of citizens to the Christians of several regions of Arabia, as well as to the Jews and Sabæans: though, doubtless, both the *Testamentum et pactiones initæ inter Mohammedem et Christianæ fidei cultores* (brought from the east by the Capuchin *Pacificus Scaliger*, and printed at Paris, 1630. 4to. and often afterwards), and the *Pactum Muhammedis, quod indulsit Monachis montis Sinai et Christianis in universum* (in Pococke's description of the East. Lond. 1743. fol. T. 1. p. 268) in which distinguished privileges are granted to *all* Christians, are spurious. cf *T. C. Tychsen comm. qua disquiritur, quatenus Muhammedes aliarum religionum sectatores toleraverit*, in the *Commentationes Soc. Reg. Gotting.* vol. XV. *class. hist. et philol.* p. 152 seq.

CHAPTER SECOND.

HISTORY OF THE GREEK CHURCH.

§ 126.

MONOTHELETIC CONTROVERSY.

Original documents to be found in the Acts of the first Synod of the Lateran, in the year 649 (vid. *Mansi* T. X. p. 863, seq.) and the Acts of the sixth œcumenical Council in the year 680 (*Mansi* XI. p. 190 seq.). *Anastasii Bibliothecarii* (about the year 870) collectanea iis quæ spectant ad historiam Monothelit. (prim ed J. Sirmond. Paris, 1620. 8vo. in Sirm. Opp. T. III. in Bibl. PP. Lugdun. T. XII. p. 833. Also in *Gallandius* T. XIII. and scattered in *Mansi* T. X. and XI.)

Historical authorities: Theophanes (see p. 314) pag. 274 seq. *Nicephorus* Patriarch of Constantinople, † 828) breviarium historiæ from 602 to 769. prim. ed. D. Petavius. Paris. 1616. 8vo. From these sources the later historians Georgius Cedrenus (1057) and Joh. Zonaras (1118) have drawn.

Works on this subject: *F. Combefisii* historia hæresis Monothelitarum ac vindiciæ actorum sextæ synodi in his Nov. Auctarium Patrum. T. II. p. 3–198 (Paris. 1648). Walchs Ketzerhistorie Th. 9. S. 3 ff.

This controversy grew out of a new attempt to reconcile the Monophysites with the church. The emperor Heraclius (A. D. 611–641), in the course of his Persian campaign, passed some time in Armenia and Lyria. During his stay he thought he perceived that the chief obstacle to the reunion of the Monophysites with the church was the doctrine of *two wills* in Christ. On application to Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, he decided that the doctrine of one volition in Christ was not inconsistent with the received doctrines of the church; whereupon the emperor and several of the bishops adopted it.[1] Soon after this Cyrus, one of these bishops, whom the emperor had appointed patriarch of Alexandria, proceeded to unite the Severians (a sect of the Monophysites, see § 108. Tr.) with the church by articles drawn up for the purpose, in which the Monophysite doctrine of one volition was distinctly acknowledged (A. D. 633).[2]

---

[1] Comp. *Cyri Episc. Phasidis Epist. ad Sergium* (see Mansi XI., p. 561) which mentions a κίλευσις of Heraclius to Arcadius, Archbishop of Cyprus, δύο ἐνεργείας ἐπὶ τοῦ δεσπότου ἡμῶν I. X. μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν λέγεσθαι κωλύουσα. *Sergius ad Cyrum* (ibid. p. 525) rests upon the authority of Cyril. Alex. who speaks of μίαν ζωοποιὸν ἐνέργειαν, and on the letter of Mennas to Virgilius, which speaks of ἓν τὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ θέλημα καὶ μίαν ζωοποιὸν ἐνέργειαν, though he is willing to be convinced of the contrary. *Theodorus* episc. Pharan. (Fragmente ibid. p. 567 seq.) says very decidedly εἶναι μίαν ἐνέργειαν· ταύτης δὲ τεχνίτην καὶ δημιουργὸν τὸν θεὸν, ὄργανον δὲ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα.

[2] *Cyri Epist. altera ad Sergium* (Mansi XI. p. 561) with the 9 articles of

On this occasion Sophronius, a monk of Palestine, who happened to be at Alexandria, began a vehement opposition to this doctrine, which he afterwards continued as patriarch of Jerusalem (A. D. 634).[3] Sergius now advised that nothing should be said on the disputed point,[4] in which he was seconded by Pope Honorius, who nevertheless agreed with him in thinking the new doctrine admissible.[5] Sophronius was soon after hindered from further interference by the incursions of the Abrabs; but the spark had fallen on matter too inflammable to be so quenched. In vain did the emperor attempt to end the difficulty by the edict called *ecthesis* (Ἔκθεσις), drawn up by Sergius (A. D. 638).[6] The controversy now spread also in the West. Maximus,[7] formerly the companion of Sophronius, roused up the African church to an interest in the matter, Pope John IV. refused to

---

agreement, p. 563. In the seventh of these we have, τὸν αὐτὸν ἕνα Χριστὸν καὶ υἱὸν ἐνεργοῦντα τὰ θεοπρεπῆ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα μιᾷ θεανδρικῇ ἐνεργείᾳ, κατὰ τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις Διονύσιον (Dionys. Areopag. Epist. IV. ad Cajum. The Orthodox read καινῇ θεανδρικῇ ἐνεργείᾳ).

[3] *Sophronii* Synodica (Mansi XI. p. 461).

[4] *Sergii Ep. ad Honorium* (Mansi XI. p. 529) contains also the most credible account of the origin of the controversy. He assures Cyrus, that his own advice was μηκέτι τοῦ λοιποῦ τινι συγχωρεῖν, μίαν ἢ δύο προφέρειν ἐνεργείας ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν· ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον, καθάπερ αἱ ἅγιαι καὶ οἰκουμενικαὶ παραδεδώκασι σύνοδοι, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν υἱὸν μονογενῆ τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν I. X. τὸν ἀληθινὸν θεὸν ἐνεργεῖν ὁμολογεῖν τάτε θεῖα καὶ ἀνθρώπινα, καὶ πᾶσαν θεοπρεπῆ καὶ ἀνθρωποπρεπῆ ἐνέργειαν ἐξ ἑνὸς καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ σεσαρκωμένου θεοῦ λόγου ἀδιαιρέτως προΐεναι, καὶ εἰς ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἀναφέρεσθαι· διὰ τὸ τὴν μὲν μιᾶς ἐνεργείας φωνὴν — θορυβεῖν τάς τινων ἀκοὰς, ὑπολαμβανόντων, ἐπ' ἀναιρέσει ταύτην προφέρεσθαι τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ — ἡνωμένων δύο φύσεων. — ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τὴν τῶν δύο ἐνεργειῶν ῥῆσιν πολλοὺς σκανδαλίζειν. — ἔπεσθαι ταύτῃ τὸ, καὶ δύο θελήματα ἐναντίως πρὸς ἄλληλα ἔχοντα, — δύο τοὺς τἀναντία θέλοντας εἰσάγεσθαι, ὅπερ δυσσεβές.

[5] *Honorii Epist.* I. *ad Sergium* (Mansi XI. p. 537). Extracts from *Epist.* II. *ad eundem*, ibid. p. 579.

[6] Mansi T. X. p. 992 seq. — ὅθεν ἕνα ἴσμεν υἱὸν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν I. X. — καὶ ἑνὸς καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τάτε θαύματα καὶ τὰ πάθη κηρύττομεν, καὶ πᾶσαν θεῖαν καὶ ἀνθρωπίνην ἐνέργειαν ἐνὶ καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ σεσαρκωμένῳ τῷ λόγῳ προσνέμομεν, — οὐδαμῶς συγχωροῦντες τινὶ τῶν πάντων μίαν ἢ δύο λέγειν, ἢ διδάσκειν ἐνεργείας ἐπὶ τῆς θείας τοῦ κυρίου ἐνανθρωπήσεως, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον, καθάπερ αἱ ἅγιαι καὶ οἰκουμενικαὶ παραδεδώκασι σύνοδοι, what follows is word for word the same with the passage from Sergii Ep. ad Honor. in note 4. But he continues: εἰ γὰρ ὁ μιαρὸς Νεστόριος κάκιστα διαιρῶν τὴν θεῖαν τοῦ κυρίου ἐνανθρώπησιν, καὶ δύο εἰσάγων υἱοὺς, δύο θελήματα τούτων εἰπεῖν οὐκ ἐτόλμησε, τοὐναντίον δὲ ταυτοβουλίαν τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἀναπλαττομένων δύο προσώπων ἐδόξασε, πῶς δυνατὸν τούς τὴν ὀρθὴν ὁμολογοῦντας πίστιν, καὶ ἕνα υἱὸν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν I. X. τὸν ἀληθινὸν θεὸν δοξάζοντας δύο καὶ ταῦτα ἐναντία θελήματα ἐπ' αὐτοῦ παραδέχεσθαι; ὅθεν τοῖς ἁγίοις πατράσιν ἐν ἅπασι καὶ ἐν τούτῳ κατακολουθοῦντες, ἓν θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν I. X. — ὁμολογοῦμεν, ὡς ἐν μηδενὶ καιρῷ τῆς νοερῶς ἐψυχωμένης αὐτοῦ σαρκὸς κεχωρισμένως καὶ ἐξ οἰκείας ὁρμῆς ἐναντίως τῷ νεύματι τοῦ ἡνωμένου αὐτῇ καθ' ὑπόστασιν θεοῦ λόγου, τὴν φυσικὴν αὐτῆς ποιήσασθαι κίνησιν, ἀλλ' ὁπότε καὶ ὅσον καὶ ὅσην αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς λόγος ἠβούλετο.

[7] His writings, mostly against the Monotheletæ, ed. *Franc. Combefisius.* Paris. 1675. 2 voll. fol. Prefixed to the first vol. is the old Greek Vita Max., of some importance for the history of the Monotheletæ.

[8] *Johannis Ep. ad Constantium Imp.* in Anastasii collectan. Mansi X. p. 682 seq.

accept the *ecthesis*,[8] and Pope Theodore went so far as actually to excommunicate the patriarch of Constantinople (A. D. 646). Equally unsuccessful was the attempt of Constans II. (A. D. 642–668) to restore tranquillity by the edict called *Τύπος* (Typus),[9] (A. D. 648), which merely recommended silence on the disputed point without deciding for either party.[10] And finally, at the first synod of the Lateran (649),[11] Pope Martin I. ventured to anathematize not only the doctrine of one will in Christ, but even the two imperial decrees relating to it. For this, however, he was deposed, and together with Maximus brought to Constantinople (A. D. 653), where they were treated with great cruelty, and at last died in exile.[12] By this summary proceeding the communion between Rome and Constantinople was for a time restored,[13] but was again broken off under Constantine Pogonatus (A. D. 668–685). This led to the sixth œcumenical council (A. D. 680), at which the doctrine of two wills[14] in

---

[9] Mansi T. X. p. 1029 seq. — ἔγνωμεν ἐν πολλῷ καθεστάναι σάλῳ τὸν ἡμέτερον ὀρθόδοξον λαὸν, ὡς τινῶν μὲν ἓν θέλημα ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκονομίας τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ δοξαζόντων, καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐνεργεῖν πάτερ θεῖα καὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα· ἄλλων δὲ δογματιζόντων δύο θελήματα καὶ ἐνεργείας δύο ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐνσάρκου τοῦ λόγου οἰκονομίας· καὶ τῶν μὲν ἐν ἀπολογίᾳ προτιθεμένων διὰ τὸ ἓν πρόσωπον ὑπάρχειν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. ἐν δύο ταῖς φύσεσιν ἀσυγχύτως καὶ ἀδιαιρέτως θέλοντα καὶ ἐνεργοῦντα πάτερ θεῖα καὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα· τῶν δὲ διὰ τὰς ἀδιαιρέτως ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ καὶ ἑνὶ προσώπῳ συνελθούσας φύσεις, καὶ τοῦ τὴν αὐτῶν σώζεσθαι καὶ μένειν διαφορὰν, καταλλήλως καὶ προσφυῶς ταῖς φύσεσι τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ ἕνα Χριστὸν ἐνεργεῖν πάτερ θεῖα καὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα. — θεσπίζομεν τοὺς ἡμετέρους ὑπηκόους — μὴ ἀδειαν ἔχειν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀπὸ τοῦ παρόντος περὶ ἑνὸς θελήματος ἢ μιᾶς ἐνεργείας, ἢ δύο ἐνεργειῶν καὶ δύο θελημάτων, οἱανδήποτε προφέρειν ἀμφισβήτησιν, ὅρον τε, καὶ φιλονεικίαν. Then follow threats against those who disobey.

[10] The Typus was derided as ἀνενέργητον πάντῃ καὶ ἀνεθέλητον, τουτέστιν ἄνουν, καὶ ἄψυχον, καὶ ἀκίνητον αὐτὸν τὸν τῆς δόξης θεὸν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. ἐδογμάτισαν, τοῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἀψύχοις παραπλησίως εἰδώλοις Epistola Abbatum et Monachorum in Synodo Lateranensi Mansi T. X. p. 908). So too Martin in his address, the same p. 880.

[11] *Mansi* T. X. p. 863 seq. The 20 canons in the 5th Secretarius. Can. X. seq. are directed against the Monotheletæ: Can. XIV.: Si quis secundum scelerosos hæreticos cum una voluntate et una operatione, quæ ab hæreticis impie confitetur, et duas voluntates pariterque et operationes, hoc est, divinam et humanam, quæ in ipso Christo Deo in unitate salvantur, et a sanctis patribus orthodoxe in ipso prædicantur, denegat et respuit, condemnatus sit.

[12] Vid. Martini epist. XV. et XVI, and the Commemoratio eorum, quæ sæviter acta sunt in Martinum, all from Anastasii collectan., in Mansi T. X. p. 851 seq. For an account of the sufferings of Maximus see Mansi T. XI., p. 3 seq. Anastasii Presb. epist. ad Theodosium in Opp. Maximi T. I. p. 67 seq.

[13] Namely, between the Patriarch Peter and the Pope Vitalianus. cf. Acta Synodi œcum. VI. Actio XIII. Mansi T. XI. p. 572: Ἔτι ἀνεγνώσθη — ἐπιστολὴ Πέτρου — πρὸς Βιταλιανὸν, — ἧς ἡ ἀρχὴ· πνευματικῆς εὐῤῥοσύνης πρόξενον ἡμῖν τὸ γράμμα τῆς ὑμετέρας ὁμοψύχου καὶ ἁγίας ἀδελφότητος γέγονεν.

[14] *Agathonis epistola ad Imperatores* Mansi XI. 233–286. — p. 239: Cum duas naturas, duasque naturales voluntates, et duas naturales operationes confitemur in uno domino nostro J. Ch., non contrarias eas, nec adversas ad alterutrum dicimus (sicut a via veritatis errantes apostolicam traditionem accusant, absit hæc impietas a fidelium cordibus), nec tanquam separatas in duabus personis, vel subsistentiis, sed duas dicimus unum eundemque dominum nostrum J. Ch., sicut naturas, ita et naturales in se voluntates et operationes habere, divinam scilicet et

Christ, as set forth by Pope Agatho in a long epistle addressed to the emperors, was, after a long and patient investigation, approved.[15] The Monothelites[16] not even excepting Honorius,[17] were now denounced, and peace was thus restored in the church.

---

humanam, etc. — p. 243: Apostolica ecclesia — unum dominum nostrum J. Ch. confitetur ex duabus et in duabus existentem naturis — et ex proprietatibus naturalibus unamquamque harum Christi naturarum perfectam esse cognoscit, et quidquid ad proprietates naturarum pertinet, duplicia omnia confitetur. — Consequenter itaque — duas etiam naturales voluntates in eo, et duas naturales operationes esse confitetur et prædicat. Nam si personalem quisquam intelligat voluntatem, dum tres personæ in s. Trinitate dicuntur, necesse est, ut et tres voluntates personales, et tres personales operationes (quod absurdum est et nimis profanum) dicerentur. — Ipse dominus noster J. Ch. — in sacris suis evangeliis protestatur in aliquibus humana, in aliquibus divina, et simul utraque in aliis de se patefaciens: orat quidem ad Patrem ut homo, ut calicem passionis transageret, quia in eo nostræ humanitatis natura absque solo peccato perfecta est, *Pater*, inquiens, *si possibile est*, etc. (Matth. xxvi. 39). Et in alio loco *Non mea voluntas, sed tua fiat* (Luc. xxii. 42). Further the passages *Phil.* ii. 8, obediens usque ad mortem, *Luc.* ii. 51, obediens parentibus, *Jo.* vi. 38, descendi de cœlo, ut non faciam voluntatem meam, sed voluntatem ejus qui misit me, cf. *Jo.* v. 30, also from the Old Testament, *Ps.* xl. 9. Ut faciam voluntatem tuam, Deus meus, volui. *Ps.* liv. 8, voluntarie sacrificabo tibi. Then follows the testimony of the fathers. Of the mode in which the two wills work together Agatho does not speak.

[15] Vid. the definitio (ὅρος) of the sixth Council in the Actio XVIII. Mansi XI. p. 631 seq — p. 637: ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστὸν, υἱὸν κύριον μονογενῆ, ἐν δύο φύσεσιν ἀσυγχύτως ἀτρέπτως, ἀχωρίστως, ἀδιαιρέτως γνωριζόμενον, οὐδαμοῦ τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνηρημένης διὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν, σωζομένης δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ἰδιότητος ἑκατέρας φύσεως, καὶ εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν συντρεχούσης. — Καὶ δύο φυσικὰς θελήσεις ἤτοι θελήματα ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ δύο φυσικὰς ἐνεργείας ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀμερίστως, ἀσυγχύτως κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων διδασκαλίαν ὡσπύτως κηρύττομεν. καὶ δύο μὲν φυσικὰ θελήματα οὐχ ὑπεναντία, μὴ γένοιτο, καθὼς οἱ ἀσεβεῖς ἔχησαν αἱρετικοὶ, ἀλλ' ἑπόμενον τὸ ἀνθρώτινον αὐτοῦ θέλημα, καὶ μὴ ἀντιτίττον, ἢ ἀντιπαλαῖον [ἀντίπαλον], μᾶλλον μὲν οὖν καὶ ὑποτασσόμενον τῷ θείῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ πανσθενεῖ θελήματι. — ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ αὐτοῦ σὰρξ, σὰρξ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου λέγεται καὶ ἔστιν, οὕτω καὶ τὸ φυσικὸν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ θέλημα ἴδιον τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου λέγεται καὶ ἔστι, καθά φησιν αὐτός· "ὅτι καταβέβηκα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, οὐχ ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμὸν, ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με πατρός" (Jo. vi. 38). ἴδιον λέγων θέλημα αὐτοῦ τὸ τῆς σαρκὸς, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἡ σὰρξ ἰδία αὐτοῦ γέγονεν· ὃν γὰρ τρόπον ἡ παναγία καὶ ἄμωμος ἐψυχωμένη αὐτοῦ σὰρξ θεωθεῖσα (deificata) οὐκ ἀνηρέθη, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ αὐτῆς ὅρῳ τε καὶ λόγῳ διέμεινεν, οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἀνθρώτινον αὐτοῦ θέλημα θεωθὲν οὐκ ἀνηρέθη, σέσωσται δὲ μᾶλλον κατὰ τὸν θεολόγον Γρηγόριον λέγοντα· "τὸ γὰρ ἐκείνου θέλειν τὸ κατὰ τὸν σωτῆρα νοούμενον οὐδὲ ἀπεναντίον θεῷ θεωθὲν ὅλον." δύο δὲ φυσικὰς ἐνεργείας ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀμερίστως, ἀσυγχύτως ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ι. Χ. τῷ ἀληθινῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν δοξάζομεν, τουτέστι θείαν ἐνέργειαν καὶ ἀνθρωπίνην ἐνέργειαν κατὰ τὸν θεηγόρον Λέοντα τρανέσταται φάσκοντα· "ἐνεργεῖ γὰρ ἑκάτερα μορφὴ μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας ὅπερ ἴδιον ἔσχηκε, τοῦ μὲν λόγου κατεργαζομένου τοῦτο, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τοῦ λόγου, τοῦ δὲ σώματος ἐκτελοῦντος ἅπερ ἐστὶ τοῦ σώματος." (comp. § 87, note 6.)

[16] The name Μονοθελῆται first in *Johannes Damascenus.*

[17] John IV. in the Epist. ad Constantin. (see note 8) has endeavoured to excuse Honorius on the ground that he said only, quia in salvatore nostro duæ voluntates contrariæ, id est, in membris ipsius (cf. Rom. vii. 23) penitus non consistunt, quoniam nihil vitii traxit ex prævaricatione primi hominis. So too *Maximus* in epist. ad Marinum in Mansi T. X. p. 687 and in the disputatio cum Pyrrho Ejusd. p 739. In all the measures afterwards taken in Rome against the Monotheletæ nothing was said of Honorius. On the other hand the *Synodus œcum.* VI. *Actio* XIII. (vid Mansi XI. p. 556) pronounces an anathema upon Sergius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, Petrus, Paulus, Theodorus, bishop of Pharan, καὶ Ὀνώριον

§ 127.

CONCILIUM QUINISEXTUM.*

At the two last œcumenical councils no attention had been paid to the laws regulating the constitution and government of the church. To supply this defect a new œcumenical council was called at the Trullus in Constantinople (692)[1] by Justinian II. (reigned from 685 – 695, and from 705 – 711), at which 102 canons were passed, for the most part sanctioning customs already established, or else repetitions of former canons. It seems to have been the express purpose of the Greek bishops at this council, as at the council of Chalcedon, to check in some degree the pride of the popes, just now exalted by a new triumph. Particularly unacceptable to the church of Rome were the six canons concerning *the number of the apostolical canons,*[2] *the marriage of the clergy,*[3] *the rank of the patriarch of*

τὸν γενόμενον πάπαν τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης διὰ τὸ εὑρηκέναι ἡμᾶς διὰ τῶν γενομένων παρ' αὐτοῦ γραμμάτων τρὸς Σέργιον κατὰ πάντα τῇ ἐκείνου γνώμῃ ἐξακολουθήσαντα καὶ τὰ αὐτοῦ ἀσεβῆ κυρώσαντα δόγματα. This anathema was repeated Act. XVI. p. 622, Act. XVIII. p. 655, etc. *Leo* II. in his *Epist. ad Constant. Imp.*, in which he confirms this council (Mansi XI. p. 731): Anathematizamus — nec non et Honorium, qui hanc apostolicam ecclesiam non apostolicæ traditionis doctrina lustravit, sed profana proditione immaculatam subvertere conatus est. cf. *Ejusd. Epist. ad Episc. Hispaniæ* Mansi XI. p. 1052 and *ad Ervigium Regem Hispaniæ*, Ibid. p. 1057. In the confession of faith subscribed by the following popes at their accession (*Liber Diurnus cap.* II. *tit.* 9, *professio* 2) an anathema was pronounced against auctores novi hæretici dogmatis, Sergium etc. — una cum Honorio, qui pravis eorum assertionibus fomentum impendit. — Comp. the evasions of later Catholic historians: *Platina* in vita Honorii I: Ferunt Heraclium — Pyrrhi — et Cyri fraudibus deceptum in hæresim Monothelitarum incidisse. — Hos tamen postea tanti erroris auctores, *hortante Honorio et verum ante oculos literis et nunciis ponente*, relegavit Heraclius. *Baronius* says that the text of the Acts of the 6th Council was corrupted, and that instead of Honorius we must read Theodorus: *Bellarmin*, that the letters of Honorius are either spurious or interpolated. According to *Pagi*, *Garnier*, the *Ballerini* and others, Honorius was not condemned for heresy, but negligence, and according to *Combefisius*, with the consent of Pope Agatho. All these evasions (last repeated by *M. de Maistre* du Pape, Lyon et Paris, 1821) are exposed by *Richer* historia concil. general. T. 1, p. 296. *Du Pin* de antiqua eccl. discipl. p. 349. *Bossuet* defensio declar. Cleri Gallic. T. II. p. 128 seq.

* [Names: Concilium Trullanum, Σύνοδος πενθέκτη, Conc. quinisextum, the Greeks consider it only as a continuation of the 6th Council, and call its Acts Κανόνες τῆς ἕκτης συνόδου. These Acts are in Mansi T. XI. p. 921 seq. [See Murd. Mosheim II. 184. Tr.]

[1] [Trullus, a hall in the palace at Constantinople, so called from Trullium, a bowl, which in form it resembled. Rees' Encycl. Tr.]

[2] *Can.* II. confirms LXXXV canones Apostol., whilst the Roman Church, from the time of Dionysius, admit only the first 50. This Council confirmed the decrees of that of Nice, Ancyra, New-Cæsarea, Constantinople in A. D. 381, Ephesus, Chalcedon, Sardica, Carthage, and Constantinople, A. D. 394. Also the canons of Dionysius Alexandrinus, Petrus Alex., Gregorius Thaumaturgus, Athanasius, Basil the great, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianz, Amphilochius of Iconium, Timotheus Alex. Cyril Alex., and Gennadius Patr. of Constan-

Constantinople,[4] *the fasting on Saturday,*[5] *the eating of blood and things strangled,*[6] *and the pictures of the lamb.*[7] Although these canons had been subscribed by the papal legates, the Pope, Sergius I., refused to accept them. Justinian would have had him brought to Constantinople, but was prevented by the rebellion of the garrison of Ravenna; and soon after was himself deposed.[8] Thus the acts of

---

tinople, and lastly those of Cyprian and his synod. On the other hand, many of the Western Synods, and all of the Decretals, are neglected.

[3] *Can.* XIII.: Ἐπειδὴ ἐν τῇ Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν τάξει κανόνος παραδίδοσθαι διέγνωμεν, τοὺς μέλλοντας διακόνου ἢ πρεσβυτέρου ἀξιοῦσθαι χειροτονίας καθομολογεῖν, ὡς οὐκέτι ταῖς αὐτῶν συνάπτονται γαμεταῖς· ἡμεῖς τῷ ἀρχαίῳ ἐξακολουθοῦντες κανόνι τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ἀκριβείας καὶ τάξεως, τὰ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀνδρῶν κατὰ νόμους συνοικέσια καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἐρρῶσθαι βουλόμεθα· μηδαμῶς αὐτῶν τὴν πρὸς γαμετὰς συνάφειαν διαλύοντες, ἢ ἀποστερούντες αὐτοὺς τῆς πρὸς ἀλλήλους κατὰ καιρὸν τὸν προσήκοντα ὁμιλίας. "Ὥστε εἴ τις ἄξιος εὑρεθείη πρὸς χειροτονίαν ὑποδιακόνου ἢ διακόνου ἢ πρεσβυτέρου, οὗτος μηδαμῶς κωλυέσθω ἐπὶ τοιοῦτον βαθμὸν ἐκβιβάζεσθαι γαμετῇ συνοικῶν νομίμῳ, μήτε μὴν ἐν τῷ τῆς χειροτονίας καιρῷ ἀπαιτείσθω ὁμολογεῖν, ὡς ἀποστήσεται τῆς νομίμου πρὸς τὴν οἰκείαν γαμετὴν ὁμιλίας. Ἵνα μὴ ἐντεῦθεν τὸν ἐκ θεοῦ νομοθετηθέντα καὶ εὐλογηθέντα τῇ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ γάμον καθυβρίζειν ἐκβιασθῶμεν, τῆς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου φωνῆς βοώσης· ἃ ὁ θεὸς ἔζευξεν, ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω (Matth. xix. vi.). καὶ τοῦ ἀποστόλου διδάσκοντος τίμιον τὸν γάμον καὶ τὴν κοίτην ἀμίαντον (Hebr. xiii. 4). καὶ· δέδεσαι γυναικί, μὴ ζήτει λύσιν (1 Cor. vii. 27). — χρὴ τοὺς τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ προεστηκότας ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῆς τῶν ἁγίων μεταχειρίσεως ἐγκρατεῖς εἶναι ἐν πᾶσιν. — Εἴ τις οὖν τολμήσοι, παρὰ τοὺς ἀποστολικοὺς κανόνας κινούμενος, τινὰ τῶν ἱερωμένων, πρεσβυτέρων φαμὲν ἢ διακόνων ἢ ὑποδιακόνων, ἀποστερεῖν τῆς πρὸς νόμιμον γυναῖκα συναφείας τε καὶ κοινωνίας, καθαιρείσθω. Ὡσαύτως καὶ, εἴ τις πρεσβύτερος ἢ διάκονος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα προφάσει εὐλαβείας ἐκβάλλει, ἀφοριζίσθω, ἐπιμένων δὲ καθαιρείσθω (cf. Can. Apostol. V. above, § 71, note 13) *Bellarmin de cler.* I. 10. supposes here tempore hujus synodi (Trullanæ) cœpit mos Græcorum, qui nunc est. — *Can.* III. forbids the clergy's marrying a second time, or with a widow, *Can.* VI. forbids marriage after ordination, *Can.* XII. forbids the bishops from remaining in the married state: εἰς γνῶσιν ἡμετέραν ἦλθεν, ὡς ἓν τε Ἀφρικῇ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ ἑτέροις τόποις οἱ τῶν ἐκεῖσε θεοφιλέστατοι πρόεδροι συνοικεῖν ταῖς ἰδίαις γαμεταῖς, καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐπ' αὐτοῖς προελθοῦσαν χειροτονίαν οὐ παραιτοῦνται. — ἔδοξεν ὥστε μηδαμῶς τὸ τοιοῦτον ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν γίνεσθαι· τοῦτο δὲ φαμεν, οὐκ ἐπ' ἀθετήσει ἢ ἀνατροπῇ τῶν ἀποστολικῶς προνενομοθετημένων, ἀλλὰ τῆς σωτηρίας καὶ προκοπῆς τῆς ἐπὶ τὸ κρεῖττον τῶν λαῶν προμηθούμενοι κ. τ. λ. cf. *Can.* XLVIII. (According to Zonaras and Theod. Balsamo ad Can. Apost. V. this was the first ecclesiastical law against the marriage of bishops) cf. *Calixtus* de conjugio Clericorum ed. Henke p. 389 seq.

[4] *Can.* XXXVI. referring to Can. Constant. III. (see § 91, note 8) and Can. Chalced. XXVIII. (see § 91, note 12) and using the words of this last. So too in Can XXXVIII. the 17 Can. Chalcedon. (see § 91, note 3) is word for word repeated.

[5] *Can.* IV.: Ἐπειδὴ μεμαθήκαμεν ἐν τῇ Ῥωμαίων πόλει ἐν ταῖς ἁγίαις τῆς τεσσαρακοστῆς νηστείαις τοῖς ταύτης σάββασι νηστεύειν παρὰ τὴν παραδοθεῖσαν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ἀκολουθίαν (comp. § 98, note 1) ἔδοξε τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ, ὥστε κρατεῖν καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ Ρωμαίων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀπαρασαλεύτως τὸν κανόνα τὸν λέγοντα· "εἴ τις κληρικὸς εὑρεθείη τῇ ἁγίᾳ κυριακῇ νηστεύων ἢ τὸ σάββατον πλὴν τοῦ ἑνὸς καὶ μόνου, καθαιρείσθω· εἰ δὲ λαϊκὸς ἀφοριζέσθω." (Can. Apostol. LXVII.)

[6] *Can.* LXVIII.

[7] *Can.* LXXXII.: Ἐν τισι τῶν σεπτῶν εἰκόνων γραφαῖς ἀμνὸς δακτύλῳ τοῦ προδρόμου δεικνύμενος ἐγχαράττεται (according to Joh. I. 29. — τὸν τοῦ αἴροντος τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου ἀμνοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν κατὰ τὸν ἀνθρώπινον χαρακτῆρα καὶ ἐν ταῖς εἰκόσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀντὶ τοῦ παλαιοῦ ἀμνοῦ ἀναστηλοῦσθαι ὁρίζομεν·

[8] cf. *Anastasii Biblioth.* in vita Sergii.

this council were acknowledged in the East, but not in the West,[9] and proved the first step towards the entire separation of the two churches.

§ 128.

FATE OF MONOTHELETISM.

The Monotheletic doctrines were once more revived by the emperor Philippicus Bardanes (A. D. 711 – 713), though only for a short time.[1] In Rome, indeed, they were steadily rejected,[2] but the bishops of the Greek church were as ready to subscribe to a Monotheletic creed at the command of the emperor Bardanes, as they were to return to orthodoxy under his successor Anastasius II.[3]

In Syria, however, a small party of Monothelites long maintained themselves. The religious parties in this country had each some political connexion, the Jacobites favoring the Arabs, and the Catho-

---

[9] In *Beda* de sex ætatibus and *Paulus Diac.* hist. Longob. VI. 11, called Synodus erratica. By degrees, however, some of the less offensive canons began to be cited as Canones Syn. VI. Gratianus (Decret. P. I. dist. XVI. c. 6) translates a Greek account of this Synod, and adds, Ex his ergo colligitur, quod sexta synodus bis congregata est: primo sub Constantino Imp. et nullos canones constituit, secundo sub Justiniano filio ejus, et præfatos canones promulgavit. Hence it would seem that he had adopted several of the canons. It was not till after the Reformation that the conciliabulum pseudosextum was again discovered. cf. *Calixtus* l. c. p. 401 seq.

[1] The chief authority on this subject is the Epilogus ad Acta Syn. VI. of the contemporary Deacon and Librarian of the church at Constantinople. Agathon, (prim. ed. *F. Combefisius* in the nov. auctar. PP. T. II. pag. 199 seq. *Mansi* T. XII. p. 189 seq.) Further *Nicephori* breviar. p. 31, *Theophanes*, p. 319 seq. Walchs Ketzergesch. Th. 9. S. 449 ff.

[2] *Anastasii* Bibl. vita Constantini. *Paulus Diac.* hist. Longob. VI. 33.

[3] The contemptible spirit of the Greek bishops is well illustrated in the letter of John, whom Philippicus had elevated to the See of Constantinople, to Pope Constantine, after the political changes (appended to Agathon's Epilegus in Combefis, p. 211, Mansi p. 195 seq.). Amongst other things he says: οἴδατε γὰρ καὶ ὑμεῖς — ὡς οὐ λίαν ἀντιτύπως καὶ σκληρῶς ἔχειν πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἐξουσίας ἀνάγκην ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις, ἄνευ τινὸς τέχνης καὶ περινοίας καθίστηκεν εὐμαρές· ἐπεὶ καὶ Νάθαν ὁ προφήτης οὐκ ἀστοιχεκάλυπτον τὸν ἔλεγχον τὸν περὶ τῆς μοιχείας τε καὶ τοῦ φόνου προσήγαγε τῷ Δαβὶδ, καίτοι καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Δαβὶδ προφητικῷ τετιμημένου χαρίσματι. Κατὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς, ὅστις φησὶν ὁ μέγας Βασίλειος, ἐνδιδόναι μικρὸν τῷ ἤθει τοῦ ἀνδρὸς κατεδεξάμεθα, ὥστε τὴν ἐν τοῖς καιρίοις τῆς πίστεως ὁμολογίαν, εἰ καὶ μὴ λίξεσιν, ἀλλάγε ταῖς ἐννοίαις φυλάττεσθαι ἀπαράβατον. Οὐ γὰρ ἐν λίξεσιν ἡμῖν, ἀλλ' ἐν πράγμασιν ἡ ἀλήθεια, ὁ θεῖος Γρηγόριος βοᾷ· καὶ πάλιν ἱκανῶς ἄτοτον καὶ λίαν αἰσχρὸν διορίζεται, τὸ περὶ τὸν ἦχον σμικρολογεῖσθαι. — Κατὰ τοῦτον δὴ τὸν τῆς οἰκονομικῆς καὶ κατὰ περίστασιν συμβάσεως τρόπον, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν γεγενημένων προελθεῖν πειθόμενοι, ἁγιώτατοι, μὴ ἀσύγγνωστον ἡμῖν τὸ ἐπὶ τούτοις ἔγκλημα προσαγαγεῖν καταδέξησθε· ἀλλὰ κἂν τι τῆς ἀκριβείας ἡμῖν ἡμαρτῆσθαι ὑπονοῆται, τῇ παραθέσει τῶν ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῶν οἰκονομικῶς προελθόντων ἀπολυέσθω ἀνεύθυνον καὶ πάσης ἐλεύθερον κατακρίσεως. He then appeals to the Bishops of the Robber Synod at Ephesus who condemned Flavian unjustly, καὶ ὅμως ἐν τῇ κατὰ Χαλκηδόνα ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ ἤρκεσε τούτοις πρὸς συλλείαν ἀποτρεπὴν τοῦ ἐγκλήματος ἡ τῆς ὑγιοῦς ὁμολογίας σύνθεσις, etc. and concludes that he has offered an ἀπολογίαν ἰσχυράν τε καὶ ἔννομον.

lics the Greek emperors, and hence called Melchites.* But a small and independent party had collected in Mount Libanus, around the convent of St. Maro, who adopted the Monotheletic doctrines, chose a separate patriarch of Antioch (the first being John Maro, † A. D. 701), and under the name of Maronites[4] continued to hold the doctrine of one will in Christ till the time of the crusades.[5]

CHAPTER THIRD.

HISTORY OF THE WESTERN CHURCH.

§ 129.

STATE OF THE CHURCH IN ITALY.

Important for the history of this and the following periods is *Anastasii Bibliothecarii* (about 870) *liber pontificalis* s. vitæ Rom. Pontif. a Petro Apost. usque ad Nicolaum I.[1] ed. C. Annib. Fabrotus in the Corp. hist. Byz. T. XIX. Paris. 1649. fol. with the biography of the succeeding popes Fr. Blanchini Rom. 1718–35. IV. T. fol. and in L. A. Muratorii Rerum Ital. Scriptor. T. III. P. I. Mediol. 1723. fol. — *Liber diurnus Roman. Pontificum*, compiled about A. D. 715, prim. ed. Luc. Holstenius. Rom. 1658. 8vo.[2] J. Garnerius. Paris. 1680.

---

* [From]: Syrian, Melcha, a king, *Murdock's* Mosheim, I, 495. Tr.]

[4] *Johann. Damasc.* lib. de vera sententia c. 8. Epist. de hymno trisagio c. 5. *Eutychii* Annal. Alex. T. II. p. 192.

[5] The modern Maronite writers, namely, *Abraham Echellensis* in various works, *Faustus Nayron* diss. de origine et religione Maronitarum. Rom. 1679, 8vo. *Ejusd.* Enophia fidei catholicæ. Ibid. 1694. 8vo. *Assemani* bibl. orient. T. I. p. 496 seq. have caused some confusion in the history of their sect, 1. by denying that the Maronites were ever Monotheletæ (see on the other side *Renaudot* histor. patr. Alexandr. p. 149 seq. Walchs Ketzergesch. Th. 9. S. 474 ff.); and, 2. by identifying the Maronites with the Mardaites. See on the other side *Anquetil Duperron* recherches sur les Migrations des Mardes, ancien peuple de Perse in the Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscript. Tome 50, p. 1, showing that the Mardaites, or Mards, a warlike nation of Armenia, were placed as a garrison on Mount Libanus by Constantine Pogonatus, A. D. 676 (*Theophanes* p. 295) but withdrawn A. D. 685 by Justinian II. (*Theoph.* p. 302).

[1] In this collection, the different parts of which are by very different authors, two general divisions are to be observed: the first consists of short notices of each pope, and ends with Sisinnius, soon after whose time it was compiled: the second, beginning with Constantine, gives copious biographies, and contains important materials for Ecclesiastical History in general. cf. *Emm. Schelstrate* de antiquis Rom. Pont. catalogis, ex quibus lib. Pontificalis concinnatus fuit, et de lib. Pont. auctore ac præstantia. *Jo. Ciampini* Examen lib. Pontif, *Fr. Blanchini* præf. in lib. Pont., all prefixed to Muratori's ed. above cited.

[2] This edition, which is far better than that of Garnerius, was immediately repressed by the Papal Censors. Its history and an account of its variations may be found in *Schæpflini commentt. hist. crit. Basil.* 1741. 4to. p. 409 seq.

4to (Supplementum in J. Mabillon museum Italicum, T. I. P. I. p. 32 seq. Paris, 1687. 4to.), reprinted in Chr. G. Hoffmanni novo scriptorum ac monumentorum collect. T. II. Lips. 1733. 4to.

The political consequence of the popes[3] increased in proportion as the Greek emperors, now pressed also by the Saracens, were forced to leave to them more entirely the defence of Italy against the Lombards.[4] Still they remained vassals of the emperor, had to be confirmed by him in office,[5] and paid him taxes.[6] Though during the Monotheletic troubles the popes even went so far as to appoint a vicar in Palestine,[7] Martin I. had still bitter experience of the imperial

---

[3] Honorius I. from 625–638, Severinus † 640, John IV. † 642, Theodore † 649, Martin I. banished 654, † 655, Eugenius I. † 657, Vitalianus † 672, Adeodatus † 676, Domnus I. † 678, Agatho † 682, Leo II. † 683, Benedict II. † 685, John V. † 686, Conon † 687, Sergius I. † 701, John VI. † 705, John VII. † 707, Sisinnius † 708, Constantine † 715, Gregor. II. † 731.

[4] Comp. § 115, note 26, cf. *Liber diurnus* Cap. II. Tit. IV. Representations of the Romans *de electione Pontificis ad Exarchum:* — Et ideo supplicantes quæsumus, ut inspirante Deo celsæ ejus dominationi, nos famulos voti compotes celeriter fieri præcipiat: præsertim cum plura sint capitula, et alia ex aliis quotidie procreëntur, quæ curæ solicitudinem et Pontificalis favoris expectant remedium. — Propinquantium quoque inimicorum ferocitas, quam nisi sola Dei virtus atque Apostolorum Principis per suum Vicarium, hoc est Romanum Pontificem, ut omnibus notum est, aliquando monitis comprimit, aliquando vero flectit ac modigerat hortatu, singulari interventu indiget, cum hujus solius Pontificalibus monitis, ob reverentiam Apostolorum Principis, parentiam offerant voluntariam, et quos non virtus armorum humiliat pontificalis increpatio cum obsecratione inclinat. The popes possessed already several small fortresses, erected probably for the defence of the papal patrimony. Thus *Anastasius in vita* XC. *Gregorii* II. relates that the Lombards had taken from him the Cumanum castrum; and that the Pope having in vain summoned them to surrender it, John, duke of Naples, at length interfered in his behalf and retook it from them. Pro cujus redemptione LXX auri libras ipse Sanctissimus Papa, sicut promiserat antea, dedit.

[5] As had become customary under the Ostrogoth kings. Agatho, however, received from Constantine Pogon divalem jussionem, per quam relevata est quantitas, quæ solita erat dari pro ordinatione Pontificis facienda: sic tamen, ut si contigerit post ejus transitum electionem fieri, non debeat ordinari qui electus fuerit, nisi prius decretum generale introducatur in regiam urbem secundum antiquam consuetudinem, et cum eorum conscientia et jussione debeat ordinatio provenire *(Anastasius in vita* LXXX *Agathonis.)* Benedict II. received from the same emperor the privilege ut persona, qui electus fuerit ad Sedem Apost. e vestigio absque tarditate Pontifex ordinetur *(Anastasius in vita* LXXXII. *Bened.)* Still, however, this did not obviate the necessity of confirmation by the emperor. See the forms in the *Liber diurnus*, Cap. II. *de ordinatione Summi Pontificis.* Namely, Tit. 1. *Nuntius ad Exarchum de transitu Pontificis.* Tit. 2. *Decretum de electione Pontificis* (to be subscribed by the *totus Clerus, Optimates, et Milites seu Cives.)* Tit. 3. *Relatio de electione Pontificis ad Principem.* Tit. 4. *De electione Pontificis ad Exarchum.* On the same subject Tit. 5. *ad Archiepisc. Ravennæ.* Tit. 6. *ad Judices Ravennæ.* Tit. 7. *ad Apocrisiarium Ravennæ.* Tit. 8. *Ritus ordinandi Pontificis* and Tit. 9. *Professio Pontificia.*

[6] E. g. *Anastas. in vita* LXXXIV *Cononis:* Hujus temporibus pietas Imperialis relevavit per sacram jussionem suam ducenta annonæ capita (i. e. capitationem), quæ patrimonii custodes Brutiæ et Lucaniæ annue persolvebant.

[7] This was first done by the popes Theodore and Martin I. during a vacancy in the see of Jerusalem; though the Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem pro-

power, and Vitalianus was compelled to bow to Monotheletism when supported by imperial patronage. But by their triumph at the sixth synod the popes established anew their ancient character as the defenders of the true faith,[8] and from this time forward began to assume the title of "Episcopus universalis," against which Gregory the Great had so vehemently protested when assumed by the patriarch of Constantinople.[9] The attempts to humble their pride at the Concilium Quinisextum proved ineffectual. When Justinian II. attempted to bring Sergius I. to Constantinople, that he might force him to adopt the decrees of this council, the garrison of Ravenna rose in rebellion;[10] and afterwards (A. D. 1701) the mere suspicion of such an intention was sufficient to excite them to uproar.[11] At a subsequent period (A. D. 710),[12] he found it necessary, in order to confirm his own authority in Italy, to invite Pope Constantine to visit him at Constantinople, where he loaded him with marks of honor. And soon afterwards the independence of the popes was seen in their refusal to obey the heretic Philippicus Barbanes (A. D. 711 – 713).[13]

The oppressed church of Africa now yielded unresistingly to the claims of Rome.[14] In Italy, on the other hand, they still met with

---

tested against such an assumption of authority. See *Lib. Stephani Episc. Dorensis ad Synod. Rom.* (*Mansi* T. X. p. 899) and *Martini P. epist. ad Johannem Episc. Philadelphiæ* (ibid. p. 805 ssq.) Comp. Walchs Ketzerhistorie Th. 9. S. 280.

[8] Comp. Agathonis P. Ep. ad Imperatores (see § 126, note 14) *Mansi* XI. p. 239: Petrus spirituales aves ecclesiæ ab ipso redemptore omnium terna commendatione pascendas suscepit: cujus annitente præsidio hæc apostolica ejus ecclesia nunquam a via veritatis in qualibet erroris parte deflexa est, cujus auctoritatem, utpote Apostolorum omnium principis, semper omnis catholica Christi ecclesia, et universales synodi fideliter amplectentes, in cunctis secutæ sunt, etc.

[9] First in *Liber diurnus*, Cap. III. Tit. 6, in the Promissio fidei Episcopi, which belongs, according to the hypothesis of Garnerius, between A. D. 682 and 685.

[10] *Anastasius, vit.* LXXXV. *Sergii*, says: Sed misericordia Dei præveniente, beatoque Petro Apostolo et Apostolorum Principe suffragante, suamque ecclesiam immutilatam servante, excitatum est cor Ravennatis militiæ, etc.

[11] *Anastas. vit.* LXXXVI. *Joannis* VI.

[12] *Anastas. vit.* LXXXIX. *Constant.:* In die autem, qua se vicissim viderunt, Augustus Christianissimus cum regno in capite se prostravit, pedes osculans Pontificis.

[13] *Anastasii vit.* LXXXIX. *Constant.* — *Pauli Diac. hist. Longobard.* VI. 34.

[14] Comp. the mission of the African bishops to Pope Theodore in the Acts of the *Conc. Lateran. ann.* 649, *Secretarius* II. (*Mansi* X. p. 919): Magnum et indeficientem omnibus Christianis fluenta redundantem, apud apostolicam, sedem consistere fontem nullus ambigere possit, de quo rivuli prodeunt affluenter, universum largissime irrigantes orbem Christianorum, cui etiam in honorem beatissimi Petri patrum decreta peculiarem omnem decrevere reverentiam in requirendis Dei rebus. — Antiquis enim regulis sancitum est, ut quidquid, quamvis in remotis vel in longinquo positis ageretur provinciis, non prius tractandum vel accipiendum sit, nisi ad notitiam almæ sedis vestræ fuisset deductum, ut hujus auctoritate juxta quæ fuisset pronunciatio, firmaretur, indeque sumerent cæteræ ecclesiæ velut de natali suo fonteprædicationis exordium, et per diversas totius mundi regiones puritatis incorruptæ maneant fidei sacramenta salutis.

some resistance. The *bishops of Ravenna* long maintained themselves independently.[15] Amongst the *Lombards* the doctrines of the Roman church had found many followers ever since the conversion of queen Theodelinde and her son king Adelwald (A. D. 616–626), and from the time of king Grimoald († A. D. 671) became indeed the prevailing system. Still, however, they were always at variance with the popes,[16] and the church of the north of Italy continued entirely independent.[17]

§ 130.

STATE OF THE CHURCH IN FRANCE AND SPAIN.

The superior dignity of the church of Rome was the more readily admitted in the West on account of its being the only apostolic church in that region, as well as the only medium of communication with the East. The true secret of its influence, however, must be sought in the reverence with which the Western nations regarded the holy city and all that issued from it.[1]

The connexion of the *Gallican church* with Rome was only slight from the time of Gregory the Great. The chief authority was now in the hands of the king, and every trace of Metropolitan government had disappeared. In the political disturbances of the 7th century the affairs of the church also were thrown into the greatest disorder, the bishops took part in the feuds of the nobles, all discipline was neglected both by monks and clergy, and the few who attempted a reform were persecuted.[2] It was no uncommon thing for the churches

---

Taken almost word for word from the letters of the Roman bishops, Innocent I. and Zosimus to the African bishops. Comp. § 92, note 25.

[15] *Anastas. vit.* LXXIX *Doni:* Hujus temporibus Ecclesia Ravennatum, quæ se ab Ecclesia Romana segregaverat causa autocephaliæ, denuo se pristinæ Sedi Apostolicæ subjugavit. *Vit.* LXXXI *Leonis* II.: Hujus temporibus percurrente divali jussione clementissimi principis restituta est Ecclesia Ravennatis sub ordinatione Sedis Apostolicæ.—*typum autocephaliæ*, quem sibi elicuerant, ad amputanda scandala Sedis Apostolicæ restituerunt.

[16] Plancks Gesch. d. kirchl. Gesellschaftsverf. Bd. 2. S. 669 ff.

[17] It is true that there is in the *Liber diurnus*, Cap. III. Tit. 8, an *Indiculum* (sacramenti) *Episcopi de Longobardia:* but this applies only to the bishops of the papal territory (in the middle and South of Italy) who were at that time under the Lombard rule.

[1] E. g. *Anastas. vit.* XC. *Greg.* II.: after the account of the great victory gained by Charles Martell and Duke Eudo of Aquitania over the Saracens near Poitiers (A. D. 732), he relates that Eudo announced it to the Pope, adjiciens, quod anno præmisso in benedictionem a prædicto viro eis directis tribus spongiis, quibus ad usum mensæ Pontificis apponuntur, in hora, qua bellum committebatur, idem Eudo Aquitaniæ princeps populo suo per modicas partes tribuens ad sumendum eis, nec unus vulneratus est, nec mortuus ex his, qui participati sunt.

[2] For instance, Leodogar, bishop of Autun, was put to death by the Majordomo Ebrun, A. D. 678. Aigulf, abbot of a convent near Lirinum, attempting to preserve discipline amongst his monks, was much abused, expelled from the convent, and at length murdered A. D. 675. See the lives of both in *Mabillon*, Act. SS. Ord. Benedicti.

to be robbed; and Charles Martell (A. D. 717 – 741) even distributed ecclesiastical revenues and ecclesiastical offices in usufruct amongst his soldiers.[3]

In the *Spanish church*, the strict subordination to the church of Rome, to which they had submitted whilst oppressed by Arian masters, began gradually to relax in proportion as the doctrines of the true church spread amongst the Goths.[4] In their elective monarchies, too, the bishops were of no inconsiderable political importance, as well from the importance of their voice in the election of the king, as by the necessity of supporting a tottering throne by the sanctions of the church;[5] and this cherished in them a feeling of self-respect,

---

[3] Comp. § 122, note 5, *Bonifacius Ep.* 132 (ed. Würdtwein Ep. 51) *ad Zachariam* about 742: Franci enim, ut seniores dicunt, plus quam per tempus LXXX. annorum Synodum non fecerunt, nec Archiepiscopum habuerunt, nec Ecclesiæ canonica jura alicui fundabant vel renovabant. Modo autem maxima ex parte per civitates Episcepales sedes traditæ sunt Laicis cupidis ad possidendum, vel adulteratis Clericis, scortatoribus, et publicanis sæcularitер ad perfruendum. *Hadriani P. I. Ep. ad Tilpinum Archiep. Rhem.* in *Flodoardi hist. eccl. Rhem.* lib. *II.* c. 17, and in *Mansi* XII. p. 844. *Hincmar epist.* VI. *ad Episc. diœcesis Remensis* c. 19: Tempore Caroli Principis — in Germanicis et Belgicis ac Gallicanis provinciis omnis religio Christianitatis pene fuit abolita, ita ut, Episcopis in paucis locis residuis, Episcopia Laicis donata et rebus divisa fuerint; adeo ut Milo quidam tonsura Clericus, moribus, habitu et actu irreligiosus laicus, Episcopia Rhemorum ac Trevirorum usurpans simul per multos annos pessumdederit, et multi jam in orientalibus regionibus (East Franks) idola adorarent et sine baptismo manerent. cf. *Chronicon Virdunense* (written about A. D. 1115) in Bouquet Rer. Gall. et Franc. script. T. III. p. 364. For this, however, Charles was duly abused by the clergy after his death. Boniface wrote to Athelbald, king of Mercia, to deter him from a similar course (*Baronius ann.* 745 *no.* 11): Carolus quoque Princeps Francorum, multorum monasteriorum eversor, et ecclesiasticarum pecuniarum in usus proprios commutator, longa torsione et verenda morte consumtus est. (This passage is wanting, however, in the ed. of Boniface's letters by Serarius Ep. 19). A hundred years later Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, in the *prologus in vitam b. Remigii* (written about 854), and write more largely in his *Epist. Synodi Carisiacensis ad Ludov. Germ. Regem*, A. D. 858, (*Capitularia Caroli Calvi Tit.* XXVII. c. 7, b. *Baluzius* II. p. 108. *Bouquet* l. c. p. 659), says, Carolus Princeps, Pipini Regis pater, qui primus inter omnes Francorum Reges ac Principes res Ecclesiarum ab eis separavit atque divisit, pro hoc solo maxime est æternaliter perditus. Nam S. Eucherius Aurelianensium Episc. — in oratione positus ad alterum est sæculum raptus, et inter cætera, quæ Domino sibi ostendente conspexit, vidit illum in inferno inferiori torqueri. Cui interroganti ab Angelo ejus ductore responsum est, quia Sanctorum judicatione, qui in futuro judicio cum Domino judicabunt, quorumque res abstulit et divisit, ante illud judicium anima et corpore sempiternis pœnis est deputatus, et recipit simul cum suis peccatis pœnas propter peccata omnium, qui res suas et facultates in honore et amore Domini ad Sanctorum loca in luminaribus divini cultus, et alimoniis servorum Christi ac pauperum pro animarum suarum redemtione tradiderant. Qui in se reversus s. Bonifacium et Fulradum, Abbatem monasterii s. Dionysii, et summum Capellanum Regis Pippini ad se vocavit, eisque talia dicens in signum dedit, ut ad sepulchrum illius irent, et si corpus ejus ibidem non reperissent, ea quæ dicebat, vera esse concrederent. Ipsi autem — sepulchrum illius aperientes, visus est subito exisse draco, et totum illud sepulchrum interius inventum est denigratum, ac si fuisset exustum. Nos autem illos vidimus, qui usque ad nostram ætatem duraverunt, qui huic rei interfuerunt, et nobis viva voce veraciter sunt testati quæ audierunt atque viderunt. cf. *Acta SS. Februarii* T. III. p. 211 seq.

[4] Plancks Gesch. d. christl. kirchl. Gesellschaftsverfassung, Bd. 2. S. 692 ff.

[5] Planck l. c. S. 235, 246. *Gregor. Tur. hist. Franc.* III. c. 30: Sumpserant

the influence of which may easily be traced in their relations to the popes.[6] All connexion between the churches was at length broken off by king Witiza (A. D. 701 – 710;[7] though this step was attended with no important consequences, as the whole kingdom was soon after overrun by the Saracens.

---

enim Gothi hanc detestabilem consuetudinem, ut si quis eis de regibus non placuisset, gladio eum adpeterent: et qui libuisset animo, hunc sibi statuerent regem. Comp. esp. *Concil. Tolet.* IV. (633) *can.* 75. (*Mansi* X. p. 637 seq.): Post instituta quædam ecclesiastici ordinis — postrema nobis cunctis sacerdotibus sententia est, pro robore nostrorum regum et stabilitate gentis Gothorum pontificale ultimum sub Deo judice ferre decretum. Long exhortation to be faithful to their kings. Then: Nullus apud nos præsumtione regnum arripiat, nullus excitet mutuas seditiones civium, nemo meditetur interitus regum: sed et defuncto in pace principe, primates totius gentis *cum sacerdotibus* successorem regni concilio communi constituant. Then follows the solemn condemnation of all who should disregard these injunctions: Anathema sit in conspectu Dei Patris et angelorum, atque ab ecclesia catholica, quam profanaverit perjurio, efficiatur extraneus, et ab omni cœtu Christianorum alienus cum omnibus impietatis suæ sociis etc. Further: Anathema sit in conspectu Christi et apostolorum ejus, atque ab ecclesia cath. etc. as above. Finally Anathema sit in conspectu Spiritus sancti, et Martyrum Christi, etc. — Further on: Te quoque præsentem regem, futurosque sequentium ætatum principes humilitate qua debemus deposcimus, ut moderati et mites erga subjectos existentes cum justitia et pietate populos a Deo vobis creditos regatis. — Ne quisquam vestrum solus in causis capitum aut rerum sententiam ferat, sed consensu publico, cum rectoribus ex judicio manifesto delinquentium culpa patescat. — Sane de futuris regibus hanc sententiam promulgamus, ut si quis ex eis contra reverentiam legum, superba dominatione et fastu regio, in flagitiis et facinore, sive cupiditate crudelissimam potestatem in populis exercuerit, anathematis sententia a Christo domino condemnetur, et habeat a Deo separationem atque judicium, etc.

[6] Compare what is said by Julian, archbishop of Toledo, concerning the remarks on his confession of faith made by Benedict II. in the *Conc. Toletan.* XV. (A. D. 688), *Mansi* T. XII. p. 9 seq. He closes as follows: Jam vero si post hæc et ab ipsis dogmatibus patrum, quibus hæc prolata sunt, in quocumque [Romani] dissentiant, non jam cum illis est amplius contendendum, sed, majorum directo calle inhærentes vestigiis, erit per divinum judicium amatoribus veritatis responsio nostra sublimis, etiamsi ab ignorantibus æmulis censeatur indocilis.

[7] The case of Witiza illustrates sufficiently the manner in which the historical personages of the middle ages were treated by the clergy, when they happened to differ from them in opinion. The first aspersions of Witiza are in *Alphonsi* M. Chronicon Hispaniæ (about A. D. 866) exaggerated by *Rodericus Ximenius* Archbishop of Toledo, in his historia Hispaniæ (A. D. 1243), lib. III. c. 15 – 17, and *Lucas*, Episc. Tudensis, in the continuation of Isidore's Chronicon (A. D. 1236). After relating many infamous deeds of Witiza *Rodericus* says, l. c. c. 16 (in *Andr. Schotti* Hispania illustrata. Francof. 1603. fol. T. II. p. 62): Verum quia ista sibi in facie resistebant, [clerici] propter vexationem pontificis [Episc. Toletani] ad Romanum pontificem appellabant. Vitiza facinorosus timens, ne suis criminibus obviarent, et populum ab ejus obedientia revocarent, dedit licentiam, immo præceptum, omnibus clericis, ut uxores et concubinas unam et plures haberent juxta libitum voluptatis, et ne Romanis constitutionibus, quæ talia prohibent, in aliquo obedirent, et sic per eos populus retineretur. *Lucas Tudensis* (Schotti T. IV. p. 69): Et ne adversus eum insurgeret s. ecclesia, episcopis, presbyteris, diaconibus et cæteris ecclesiæ Christi ministris carnales uxores lascivus Rex habere præcepit, et ne obedirent Romano Pontifici sub mortis interminatione prohibuit. See on the other hand: Vertheidigung des Königs Witiza von Don Gregorio Mayans v. Siscar (in Büschings Magazin f. d. neue Historie u. Geographie, Th. 1. S. 379 ff. Hamburg, 1767, 4to., where the extracts from the manuscript of *Isidorus Pacensis* Chron, Hispaniæ (about 754) represent that king as a truly noble character, e. g. decesso jam patre florentissime supra-

§ 131.

STATE OF THE CHURCH IN THE BRITISH ISLANDS.

Amongst the Anglo-Saxons Christianity had at first to sustain a hard struggle with paganism, but afterwards was diffused with great rapidity through all the kingdoms, being adopted last in Sussex in the year 663.[1] All this was accomplished chiefly through the instrumentality of Roman missionaries, Northumberland alone being converted by the Scottish clergy, who of course introduced the peculiar customs of their church. This led to the revival of the old controversies between them and the Anglo-Roman clergy, which ended in a conference at the synod of Strenaeshalh (Synodus Pharensis, A. D. 664), at which Oswys, king of Northumberland, decided in favor of the Roman ordinances;[2] and from that time forward the dominion of the church of Rome over the Anglo-Saxons was fixed. This was still more confirmed by the efforts and influence of Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury (A. D. 668 – 690), who was sent out from Rome. The Anglo-Saxon church not only adopted the Roman doctrines[3] and ritual, the Gregorian chant, and the Latin service,[4]

---

fatos per annos regnum retemptat, atque omnis Hispania gaudio nimio freta alacriter lætatur. The decrees which were so displeasing to the clergy seem to have been issued at the 18th Concil. Toletan. A. D. 701, of which council *Rodericus* III. 15, says, Hic [Witiza] in ecclesia S. Petri, quæ est extra Toletum, cum episcopis et magnatibus super ordinatione regni concilium celebravit, *quod tamen in corpore canonum non habetur.* Comp. Isidorus Pacensis (Büsching l. c. S. 389) Sisiberto relegato Felix urbis regiæ, Toletanæ Sedis Episcopus gravitatis et prudentiæ excellentia nimie pollet et concilia satis præclara etiam adhuc cum ambobus Principibus [Egica et Witiza] agit.

[1] Schmidts Kirchengeschichte Bd. 2. S. 81 ff. Bd. 3. S. 184 ff. C. F. Stäudlins Kirchengeschichte von Grossbritannien (2 Thle. Göttingen, 1819, 8vo.), Th. 1. S. 56 ff. [See Murdock's Mosheim 1, 501, note 5. Tr.]

[2] *Bedæ* hist. eccl. gentis Anglorum III. 25. The close of the dispute held between the Scotch Bishop Colman and the English Presbyter Wilfried is remarkable. The former appealed to Anatolius and Columban, the latter to Peter, closing with the passage Matth. xvi. 18: tu es Petrus, &c. King Oswy then said, Verene, Colmane, hæc illi Petro dicta sunt a Domino? Qui ait: vere, Rex. At ille: habetis, inquit, vos proferre aliquid tantæ potestatis vestro Columbæ datum? At ille ait: nihil. Rursum autem Rex: si utrique vestrum, inquit, in hoc sine ulla controversia consentiunt, quod hæc principaliter Petro dicta, et ei claves regni cælorum sunt datæ a Domino? Responderunt: etiam, utique. At ille ita conclusit: et ego vobis dico, quia hic est ostiarius ille, cui ego contradicere nolo, sed in quantum novi vel valeo, hujus cupio in omnibus obedire statutis, ne forte me adveniente ad fores regni cælorum, non sit qui reserat, averso illo qui claves tenere probatur. Hæc dicente Rege faverunt assidentes quique sive adstantes majores una cum mediocribus, et abdicata minus perfecta institutione, ad ea quæ meliora cognoverant, sese transferre festinabant.

[3] In particular the doctrine of a purgatory, comp. Beda III. 19, V. 13.

[4] *Beda* IV. 2. (Theodorus): peragrata insula tota, quaquaversum Anglorum gentes morabantur, — rectum vivendi ordinem, ritum celebrandi pascha canonicum, per omnia comitante et coöperante Adriano disseminabat. Isque primus erat archiepiscopus, cui omnis Anglorum ecclesia manus dare consentiret. Et quia literis sacris simul et sæcularibus, ut diximus, abundanter ambo erant in-

but proved more submissive to the authority of the Pope than any other church of the German stock.[5]

Great efforts were now made by the Anglo-Saxon church to persuade the Britons and Scots also to adopt the Roman ordinances. The abbot Adamnan, in the beginning of the 8th century, was particularly successful in this respect amongst the Britons and in the south of Ireland,[6] as also the monk Egbert amongst the northern Picts (A. D. 715).[7]

The contest between the two churches awakened an attention to philosophical and theological studies at that time very unusual.[8] The learned archbishop Theodore, a native of Tarsus, and the abbot Adrian, whom he brought with him, contributed especially to the pursuit of these studies by establishing schools, and diffusing the knowledge of the Greek language.[9] Soon after this England could boast the most learned man of his time, and the admiration of the whole Western world. This was BEDA VENERABILIS, a monk in the convent of Peter and Paul at Yarrow († A. D. 735).[10]

---

structi, congregata discipulorum caterva, scientiæ salutaris quotidie flumina irrigandis eorum cordibus emanabant: ita ut etiam metricæ artis, astronomicæ et arithmeticæ ecclesiasticæ disciplinam inter sacrorum apicum volumina suis auditoribus contraderent. Indicio est, quod usque hodie supersunt de eorum discipulis, qui Latinam Græcamque linguam æque ut propriam, in qua nati sunt, norunt. Neque unquam prorsus ex quo Britanniam petierunt Angli, feliciora fuere tempora, dum et fortissimos Christianosque habentes reges cunctis barbaris nationibus essent terrori, et omnium vota ad nuper audita cœlestis regni gaudia penderent: et quicunque lectionibus sacris cuperent erudiri, haberent in promptu magistros qui docerent: et sonos cantandi in ecclesia — ab hoc tempore per omnes Anglorum ecclesias discere cœperunt, etc.

[5] Plancks Gesch. d. chr. kirchl. Gesellschaftsverf. Bd. 2. S. 704 ff.

[6] *Beda* V. 16.

[7] *Beda* V. 23.

[8] Before the time of Theodore it had been customary to resort to Ireland for the pursuit of these studies — *Beda* III. 27: multi nobilium simul et mediocrium de gente Anglorum — relicta insula patria, vel divinæ lectionis vel continentioris vitæ gratia illo secesserant. Et quidam quidem mox se monasticæ conversationi fideliter mancipaverunt, alii magis circumeundo per cellas magistrorum lectioni operam dare gaudebant: quos omnes Scoti libentissime suscipientes, victum eis quotidianum sine pretio, libros quoque ad legendum et magisterium gratuitum præbere curabant. cf. Murray in Nov. Comm. Soc. Gott. (see § 124, note 3) T. II. p. 109.

[9] See *Beda*, note d.

[10] A proof of his wide spread fame is *Sergii* P. I. *Ep. ad Ceolfridum* (Beda's abbot) A. D. 700 in Guilelmi Malmsburiensis de red. gestis Regum Angl. I. 3, (complete ex Ms. in Wilkins Concil. Magn. Brit. vol. I. p. 63 seq.): — hortamur Deo dilectam bonitatis tuæ religiositatem, ut, quia exortis quibusdam ecclesiasticarum causarum capitulis, non sine examinatione longius innotescendis, opus nobis sunt ad conferendum artis literatura imbuti; — absque aliqua immoratione religiosum famulum Dei Bedam venerabilis monasterii tui ad veneranda limina Apostolorum principum dominorum meorum Petri et Pauli, amatorum tuorum ac protectorum, ad nostræ mediocritatis conspectum non moreris dirigere. Quem favente Domino tuisque sanctis precibus non diffidas prospere ad te redire, peracta præmissorum capitulorum cum auxilio Dei desiderata solennitate. Beda's writings embrace Natural Philosophy, Chronology, Philosophy, Grammar, Astronomy, Arithmetic, &c., and give a view of all the learning of the time. — His-

Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, wrote the first book of penance (liber pœnitentialis)[11] which had appeared in the Western church, on the plan of that by John Jejunator (see § 112). It is evident that it must have been well received in England by the similar works of Beda and Egbert, archbishop of York († A. D. 767),[12] which appeared soon after. Out of England, however, these books seem as yet to have been unknown.

§ 132.

SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY IN GERMANY.

Schmidt's Kirchengeschichte. Th. 4. p. 10 ff.

The attempts to convert the Germans, whether made by Franks, Anglo-Saxons, or Scots, were as yet but partially successful.

The Irish monk Kilian[1] lost his life in the cause near Wurzburg (A. D. 689), as also the French Monk Emmereau[2] in the neighbourhood of Ratisbonne (A. D. 654).

Better success, however, attended the efforts of Ruprecht[3] in Bavaria, who baptized duke Theodore († A. D. 696), and founded the church of Salzburg († A. D. 718); and of Corbinian,[4] who gathered a church in Freysingen († A. D. 730).

The efforts of certain Anglo-Saxon monks (from A. D. 690) to convert the northern German nations were still more ineffectual.[5] Willebrord,[6] the first bishop of Wiltaburg (Utrecht) succeeded indeed with that part of the Frieslanders, who had been subdued by the Franks, but could make no impression on the rest of the nation († after A. D. 736): the two Ewalds were murdered by the Saxons;[7]

---

toria ecclesiast. gentis Anglorum libb. V. from Julius Cæsar to A. D. 731 (ed. Fr. Chifletius. Paris, 1681. 4to. Joh. Smith. Cantabrig. 1722. fol.). De sex ætatibus mundi liber. Vitæ of English monks. — Numerous commentaries on the S. S. Homilies, Letters, etc. *Opp. ed. Basil.* 1563. T. VIII. fol. *Colon.* 1688. T. IV. fol.

[11] Ed. *Jac. Petit* Paris, 1677. 2 Tomi. 4to. Still this ed. is imperfect and not free from interpolations, and the real work of Theodore seems to be no longer extant; see *Assemani bibl. juris orient. can.* lib. IV. c. 23 and 24. *Muratori Antiquitt. Ital. medii ævi* T. V. p. 711.

[12] cf. *Ballerini de ant. collectionibus canonum* P. IV. c. 6, (in *Gallandii syll. ed. Mogont.* T. I. p. 603). The book *de remedio peccatorum* is by Egbert.

[1] *Acta* SS. *ad* d. 8 Jul.

[2] His life has been written by Aribo, the 4th bishop of Freysingen († 753), see *Acta* SS. *ad* 22 Sept.

[3] *Act.* SS. *ad* d. 27 Mart.

[4] Life of Aribo, Bishop of Freysingen, see *Acta* SS. *ad* Sept. 8.

[5] *Beda hist. eccl.* V. c. 10 seq.

[6] Life of Alcuin in *Mabillonii Act.* SS. *Ord. Bened. Sæc.* III. P. I. p. 601.

[7] *Beda* V. c. 11.

and Suidbert,[8] who had at first been received and listened to amongst the Boructi, was forced to retreat before the invading Saxons, and afterwards founded a convent (Kaiserswerth) on an island in the Rhine granted him by Pepin († A. D. 713).

---

[8] *Beda* V. c. 12, cf. *Acta* SS. *ad* d. 1 Mart.

END OF VOLUME I. OF TRANSLATION.

Date Due

SE 175

BW903 .G454 v.1
Text-book of ecclesiastical history.
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00015 7877